The Forum

MARCH, 1921

THE PLATITUDE IN DIPLOMACY

By K. SHIDE KARA

Japanese Ambassador to the United States

THE position of the diplomat who appears in print is always one of delicacy. If pending questions exist between his own government and that to which he is accredited, he cannot openly urge the cause of his own government without appearing in the rôle of a special pleader. It matters not how honest he may be in his convictions or how worthy the cause he represents. He is under suspicion even when he speaks the truth. If, on the other hand, he ventures to find some virtue in the contentions of his opponents, his own countrymen may question his patriotism—if not his wisdom—and he is liable to find himself distrusted and discredited.

Under such circumstances the diplomat may be regarded as an exponent of that art which is said to use speech to conceal thought. It is unfortunate for the cause of international relationships that this evil interpretation has persisted so long and that the practice of a noble profession should be linked in the popular mind with ideas of duplicity and deceit.

I do not deny that much of this bad reputation has been fairly earned; but even in these days of the new diplomacy when nations are supposed to reach "open covenants, openly arrived at," the suspicion lingers that diplomacy is the science of deception. The public activities of a diplomat may, therefore, be likened to one who finds himself located between the devil and the deep blue sea.

There is one field, however, which is never closed to the diplomat who aspires to appear in print or on the rostrum. He is always safe in the arena of platitudes and in the use of wise and ancient saws. He may not frankly discuss living questions which are vital to the interests of his own people and his neighbors—in his own day and generation—but he may quote scripture or voice his sentiments in high-sounding generalizations.

It is undoubtedly true that the utterances of official diplomacy are largely discounted by a skeptical public because of a general belief in their unreliability. Much has been done by writers of the Machiavelli order and the fabricators of "scraps of paper" to foster this idea. Recognizing, then, this handicap, it may properly be asked why the writer of this paper should venture into a field which promises to be so barren of results.

There is, perhaps, but one justification for such a course and that is based upon his conviction that the platitude itself has priceless value and may, at times, be used to noble ends. To the extent that the platitude expresses fundamental truth—to the extent that it voices great and beneficent principles of human action—it cannot be invoked too often. The Golden Rule is doubtless one of the oldest platitudes known to the human race, but it is still useful and beautiful and inspiring. There is no danger that its repetition will be overdone or that any harm will come to mankind from those who insist upon keeping this great precept in the spot light. So with countless other precious truths which the experience of mankind has sanctified and clothed in the language of proverbs. They are lights along the shore

which should be kept burning, and never are they so useful as in times of storm and danger.

There has been no time, perhaps, in the history of the world, when the lessons of experience were more valuable than they are today. There has been no time when the question seemed more pertinent as to what the people of the world have learned from the past experiences of the race. In the long struggle which man has made from barbarisms to modern civilization, one great fact stands out forever in bold relief. The real victories of men have been moral victories. Wherever progress has been made and human interests have been advanced the struggle has centered about some eternal principle of right that would not down. Those structures only have endured which have had their foundations in justice and righteousness.

It does not require much wisdom, or reading of history, to understand that those human enterprises which have failed have sought to perpetuate themselves by some form of injustice. The whole pathway of humanity, so far as we can follow it, is strewn with the wrecks of governments and institutions which have sought to enthrone some form of error. The unhappy condition of the world today proves all too clearly how futile are the efforts of men to achieve peace and happiness under conditions which ignore or deny inalienable human rights. There is no expediency which can convert wrong into right. Sooner or later the thing based on wrong topples over and falls into the dust. Nothing remains settled until it is settled right. This is as true of individuals as of nations. The world's great heroes are the men who still live and influence human thought and action, although their bodies were long since dust. They are the men who championed some holy cause and, fighting for it, won immortality. The brilliant men who conquered cities and built empires, while trampling their fellows into the dust, have left us nothing but the solemn warning which may be gathered from the record of their wickedness and folly.

Platitudes, you will say, are valueless in this age of action. Each generation of men must be a law unto itself. Forget the past and let the future take care of itself. Men of today must "arrive." They must "get there," in the argot of the street, and he who delays the procession is but an idle visionary. On with the dance and let the devil take the hindmost!

It is for the people of the world to say whether this philosophy of folly and greed shall go unchecked. If it is true, for instance, that nothing is to be learned from the world's experiences of the past five years, then, indeed, is the outlook discouraging. The writer is happy to believe that a creed so dark and hopeless will not continue to dominate the minds of men. To accept it would mean loss of faith in human progress and ignoble surrender to the powers of evil. It is his conviction that the minds of increasing numbers of men grow broader as time advances and that the quickening powers of sympathy and charity will yet prevail over error and wrong. Men and nations in their relations to each other are slowly learning that there are powers superior to physical force and sordid selfishness. They will yet realize the truth and the wisdom of the old platitude that honesty is the best policy. They will finally learn that consideration for one's neighbor is the truest kindness to one's self.

And so, as the modest conviction of one diplomat who has been asked to appear in print, I venture to express the belief that Japan and America will be wise enough to remain friends. They will be wise enough to measure and weigh the lessons of history and will bring to bear upon every issue which threatens their peace and friendship the soothing influences of reason, charity and patience. True patriotism calls for such a course for there are no other roads which lead to lasting harmony. America and Japan will be neighbors always. For good or for evil their relations must be the relations of all time. It is for this generation to determine how the paths of the future are to be

blazed out. If we ignore the lessons of history—if we dismiss as idle platitudes the solemn warnings which come to us from the past—our differences will remain unadjusted. Expediency is a poor crutch upon which to lean and will not carry us far. We must have the courage to face every issue and find its true solution now; otherwise it will rise to plague us in the days to come.

I have the optimism to believe that no differences are insurmountable which are approached in a spirit of kindliness and justice; and that is the spirit which Japan invokes, and which she promises to extend, in all her relationships with the great American people. International questions, reduced to their lowest terms, are moral questions. The errant diplomat, therefore, who finds it in his heart to seize upon the moral question, which has been reduced by time to a shallow platitude, and to guide it back to life and vigor, may find in that occupation his greatest usefulness.

IN PASSING

By JAMES RAVENSCROFT

It was not spring, nor nearly spring;
No sweet, shy flowers, no birds to sing;
The wind blew cold as old regrets;
But when she lifted, glancingwise,
To me her gentle gray-green eyes,
I thought of violets.

She passed me with a merry swirl
Of raiment in the rough wind's whirl,
A comely, pure-faced girl; and trills
Of some north-faring spring-time bird
Singing the earth awake, I heard,
And scented daffodils.

THE PASSING OF THE WHITE RACE

By GEORGE BRANDES

In July, 1881, at a time when no reference a general alliance against Germany is to be found either in European or American letters, George Brandes wrote his since famous *"Foreboding"* of the great war that was to come thirty-three years later.

Political conservatism as represented by Germany of that period he felt to be a misfortune for all humanity, and he remarked that only older people, who were soon to pass away, were imbued with a liberal spirit. And while other European nations would progress towards greater liberty and democracy, Germany, "a stronghold of conservatism in the midst of Europe," will, he said, "lie there, old, decrepit, armed to the teeth with all the weapons of murder and defence which science can invent. And there will come great struggles and great wars. If Germany wins, Europe, in comparison with America, will politically be like Asia to Europe. But if Germany loses—"but it is not seemly to play the prophet," Brandes concluded.

In the sixties, when Russia and Germany were very friendly and there was no suggestion of any break between them, Brandes wrote that Poland's only chance of independence lay in the possibility of a war between those two nations.

To deal with more recent events, Brandes wrote in June, 1916, that if the war were to last much longer, a social revolution would break out.

"The social revolution," he wrote, "which has been kept down as long as humanity retained one grain of sense, will, if the war lasts much longer, break out with the same violence as that with which battles are now raging. It will follow in the wake of the war as the Commune of Paris followed the war of 1871, and the few remnants of a higher intellectual civilization left from the carnage will be razed to the ground as ruthlessly as the beautiful churches and townhalls in Belgium and Northern France are destroyed to-day."

Events which have since taken place in Russia, Germany and Hungary fully confirm these predictions.

And now again Brandes turns to the future—to the future of Europe, of the Western world.—*Editor of* THE FORUM.

* * * *

AFTER having ruined herself and bled herself to death by war, Europe has sealed her doom. It may take fifty years, perhaps a century, to fully realize this, but not more.

The danger that threatens Europe is not military. It is industrial. And as far as I can see, it is unavoidable. The danger comes from the East, from Japan, but to a much greater extent from China. In much too short a time Europe will succumb industrially in competition with the Far East.

Victory in industrial competition lies with the side that can work hardest, most effectively, most economically and wisely. The Chinese far surpass any European people in this respect.

Europeans have erroneously looked upon Orientals as a lower race, and they may, perhaps, be able to dominate China. But that will not change the final result. Peoples of a lower race, Kaffers under British rule and Javanese under Dutch, multiply more rapidly than their masters.

Besides the climate sets limitations for the development of the so-called higher races. The latter, for instance, can't thrive in the tropics nor in the Far North. The Chinese, on the other hand, have the extraordinary advantage of being able to thrive in every climate and in every climate they not only multiply but acquire wealth. The work of the white man can never compete with that of the yellow man, conditions being equal.

Furthermore, the white race has wasted its strength in a thousand year old militarism. The Chinese have been an industrial people for many thousand years. There is no form of handiwork or craft in which the Chinese cannot compete successfully with the white race. The history of the Chinese in Australia proves this. Australia, like the United States, has had to legislate against immigration from the East for this reason. In the Eastern tropics the Chinese because of their ability have practically driven out the Malayan races.

The example of the Japanese shows that an Eastern race that willingly acquires Western civilization increases more rapidly than the white race, during the same span of life. During the first twenty-two years after Japan had begun her Europeanization her population increased 25 per cent.

Better hygiene was probably responsible for much of this increase, but even granting this, compare the Japanese population's increase of 25 per cent. with that of England, for instance, which was only 7 per cent. during the same period, while that of France showed no increase at all. Farming, tea and silk culture, as well as manufacturing increased no less than 1014 per cent. from 1883 to 1893.

China is awakening. Imagine what a Chinese advance similar to the Japanese, would mean! The progression of a country with a population of between 400 and 500 millions to begin with! Even the Japanese admit that the Chinese are their superiors in industry, commercial ability and financial perspicacity.

The Chinese are conservative, but they are not conservative in the sense that the Chinaman of today scorns shipping interests or telephones. They are conservative in the sense that through a thousand year old habit they have learned to live on almost nothing. Their pleasures and their vices are inexpensive. Their standard of life has been reduced to a minimum for thousands of years.

If, therefore, competition arises between European and American workingmen on one side—workingmen who cannot get enough out of life and who consider ease, well being, the only thing worth while—and the Chinese, on the other, who scarcely demand anything from life, the outcome will not be doubtful. If European and American workers who continually demand higher wages and shorter hours are to compete with the Chinese, who, for centuries, have been accustomed to working long hours for practically no pay, one does not need to be a prophet to foresee what will happen.

Viewed in this light—the inevitable industrial triumph of the yellow races over the white—it would seem as if the gigantic war, wrought with so many sacrifices and so many horrors, is an event of merely incidental importance, and the so-called League of Nations a fairy tale for children.

TRACTION AND FINANCE

By HON. JOHN F. HYLAN
Mayor of the City of New York

UNQUESTIONABLY the City of New York shows the most astounding combination of financial legerdemain and stock-jobbing jugglery in its traction lines of any city in the world. The traction situation in New York City has reached a crisis. This alarming condition, threatening the commercial activities, the social relations, the every day welfare of the citizens, has been brought about because the city, with a population greater than any State in the Union, with the exception of Illinois and Pennsylvania, has never enjoyed a fair or an adequate measure of home rule to which its commanding position entitles it and the needs of its people require. Instead of home rule, New York City has been given rural or up-State rule, and the result is an amazing complication confronts the citizens of a vast municipality—the largest and most prosperous on the globe. And yet the City of New York, which has a population greater than all the rest of the population of the State of New York combined, and which, in effect, is composed of five great cities—each of its boroughs exceeding in the number of its inhabitants many cities in the United States—and paying more than seventy per cent. of the expenses of the State Government, has been compelled to have the regulation of its wonderful and extensive traction systems controlled and directed, in a great measure by a State Legislature, many of the members of which are absolutely ignorant of the civic conditions and financial capacity of the Metropolis.

The State of New York has not put one penny into the traction system of the City of New York, but the city has

invested more than one-quarter of a billion dollars in it. In spite of these existing facts the Governor of the State of New York, in a recent message to the Legislature, on the transit situation in New York City, suggested the creation of a State Transit Board to consist of three up-State members appointed by the Governor (who is not a citizen of New York City), with power to increase carfares without the consent of the people's duly elected municipal authorities. In other words, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of the City of New York is to be striped of all power and the citizens deprived of all the rights they have gained over their own property. In plain language, if the Governor's will prevails, the City of New York is to be looted and sacked like the conquered cities of old.

The proposal is a monstrous invasion of the constitutional rights of the City of New York. The five-cent fare is one of the rights which the administration of New York City has fought for and has preserved for the people. This five-cent fare is the corner stone of the edifice which we call New York City. Business enterprises have extended the area of their activities in the expectation that a five-cent fare would be permanent throughout the life of the city's transit contracts, and these contracts are as sacred and as binding as any contracts ever drawn in the history of financial transactions the world over. The five-cent fare is the basis on which New York City spread out and on which the suburbs have been developed. The permanency of a five-cent fare is as much the property right of the suburban home owner as if it were written in the deed which secures to him the home bought with his savings. It must be remembered that the only benefit which the people received under the dual subway contracts, was a five-cent fare to last for the entire period of the contracts.

The plea is made by the traction magnates that the street railway systems of the City of New York cannot pay operating expenses on a five-cent frae. Anyone who rides in the subways of New York City during any hour of the day and

sees the vast crowds jammed and packed in all cars on the long trains knows, on the face of it, this is not true.

But there are very apparent reasons why street car lines, and especially the surface and elevated lines do not give the returns that they should give if they were properly and honestly conducted. Governor Miller admits in his message that the traction lines of New York City have been manipulated by financiers in the past who have worked for their own interests only and never for the interests of the public. And still the Governor insists that these same interests be given further opportunity for the exploitation of the citizens. Obviously the plan is, in addition to securing an increased carfare, to dump the antequated, over-capitalized, broken-down surface lines and elevated rattle-traps, owned by private interests, upon the taxpayers of the City of New York, and link these lines up with the municipally-owned subways which are now making large profits. What Governor Miller purposes to do is to give to the Traction Trust the privilege of extorting from the people of the City of New York from sixty to one hundred million dollars a year in increased carfares, and thus work hardships on tens of thousands of citizens who already are hard pushed to meet the daily expenses of living in a large city.

Backed by Governor Miller the Traction Trust is pleading poverty and urging that unless a larger fare is obtained the street car lines cannot be operated. How far is this true?

In the investigation by the City of New York of the claims of the Interborough Rapid Transit Company, the New York Railway Company, and the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company for increased fares some startling financial facts were unearthed. It was demonstrated beyond question that the subway is a paying institution. It earned for the year ended June 30, 1920, $2,630,953 above all operating expenses, taxes and fixed charges. The subway, owned by the City of New York, is the gold mine which pays tribute to the other lines owned by private persons. And these other

lines are like a sponge-filled with water, the water squeezed out and then sucked in again.

If one could picture to himself the spreadout corporations he would see the Interborough system reaching out from the central holding company to its gold mine, the subway, constructed with city money and owned by the city, thus obtaining revenue with which to pay premiums to those inside the circle that controls the Manhattan Elevated and the New York Railways Company which consists of the surface lines.

In the very beginning the Interborough Rapid Transit Company was guilty of tremendous extravagance and unjustified financial mismanagement. It paid huge sums for financing. It issued large amounts of securities without any cash investment or the contribution of actual property for operation. On an outstanding capital stock of $35,000,000 it paid total dividends of $65,625,000 after 1904, or a total of 187½% upon such capital stock. The dividend payments were continued down to the time when obviously the company could not afford to pay them. For example, it paid 20% in 1915, 20% in 1916, 20% in 1917, 17½% in 1918, and even two successive payments of 2¼% quarterly during the first six months of 1919. These outrageous dividend payments were continued after the company was running at a deficit and after the higher costs, due to the war, had been realized.

It is carrying at least $50,000,000 on its books as assets which are not assets at all, and either should not have been entered on the books or should have been made good long ago out of income. The company has kept these items as items of full value and has reported its net income accordingly and paid out every possible dollar in dividends. Under sound management these items should have been made good out of income and then a much smaller amount would have been available as dividends. There never was justification for an annual dividend payment of 20% a year.

The earnings from the subways since the opening have been unprecedented, and millions have been paid in dividends. Why were these dividends paid instead of keeping all, or a large portion for the high price days to come, and of which the Interborough had every reason to believe would come? If the Interborough had been content to authorize dividends of 6% per year for sixteen years (1904 to 1919, both inclusive) the dividends would have amounted to 96% or $34,200,000. This would practically be the par of the capital stock and would have left a surplus of $31,625,000 to meet the conditions which the Interborough claims confront the company at the present time.

About $34,000,000 of the stock of the Interborough was controlled by the Interborough Consolidated, a holding company. Before the receivership that company controlled the subways, the Manhattan Company, by the lease to the Interborough, more than one-half of all of the street surface lines in the Borough of Manhattan and street lines in the Borough of Queens. The greater portion of the dividends paid by the Interborough were thus paid for the purpose of keeping the price of the securities of the Interborough Consolidated at a high figure, and pay to the 4½% bond holders of the Interborough Consolidated the interest on those bonds. The bonds were issued by the Interborough Consolidated or its predecessor, the Interborough Metropolitan, for Interborough stock, on the basis of two $1,000 bonds for each $1,000 of stock. In addition to these bonds, the holders of the Interborough stock also received common stock.

On January 1, 1903, a lease was made between the Manhattan Railway Company and the Interborough Rapid Transit Company, whereby the Manhattan Company leased to the Interborough all its properties comprising all the elevated systems in the Boroughs of Manhattan and The Bronx. The lease was for a term of 999 years and was to become effective on April 1, 1903. It was agreed that the authorized capital stock of the Manhattan Company at the

time the lease took effect would be $60,000,000 of which $55,200,000 would be then outstanding, and that on April 1, 1906, the balance of new stock to the amount of $4,800,000 would be issued by the Manhattan, if permitted by law, and might be sold by the lessee. At the time of the execution of the lease the capital stock was $48,000,000.

The Interborough agreed to pay as rental dividends of not less than 6% and not more than 7% on the capital stock to January 1, 1906, and 7% per annum thereafter. Since 1906 dividends have been paid by the Interborough to holders of the stock of the Manhattan at the rate of 7% per annum of $60,000,000 of capital stock of the Manhattan Company—a larger part of which is water.

The Manhattan never paid 7% dividends on its stock prior to its being leased to the Interborough. Why should the subways pay the 7% dividends on the $60,000,000 stock of the Manhattan and also the interest on the bonds? An examination of the company's figures disclosed that at least $52,594,106 included in cost of road equipment do not properly constitute investment in elevated property. They represent securities issued without investment, discounts and obsolete property and depreciation. Deducting this amount from the Company's net monetary, book investment of the Manhattan Railway Company amounts to $60,599,856.77.

The Manhattan Railway Company is overcapitalized roughly by $52,500,000. This was divided into $26,500,000 as capital stock and $26,000,000 as bonds. The guaranteed dividend on the capital stock is 7%, and the interest on the bonds is 4%. If the excessive capitalization were removed from the elevated property, there would be a saving in dividends of $1,855,000 a year, and a saving in interest of $1,040,000 a year, or a total saving in fixed dividends and rentals of $2,895,000.

The $52,500,000 either should never have been charged to capital account, or should have been made good out of income. The company's earnings in the past have been ample for such amortization, and to bring besides a large

return on actual investment. For the years 1899, 1900 and 1901, a 4% dividend was paid on the $48,000,000 capitalization. On January 16, 1903, the capital stock was increased an additional $12,000,000, making a total of $60,000,000. This increase took place a month and a half after the Manhattan Elevated Railroad Company was leased to the Interborough, namely November 26, 1902, for 999 years with the 7% dividend guarantee.

For the year ended June 30, 1919, the subway reported a net income above all operating expenses, taxes and fixed charges amounting to $292,371.48. For the six months ended December 31, 1919, it showed an income above fixed charges of $664,123.08. For the month of December, 1919, it showed $408,956.98 above fixed charges. From the foregoing figures it shows that the earnings have been improving very rapidly and that the subway is now earning greatly in excess of its own fixed charges.

The elevated realized a deficit of $4,102,711.40 for the year ended June 30, 1919, and a deficit of $2,584,489.95 for the six months ended December 31, 1919. If the excessive capitalization were taken off and the company and the rentals adjusted accordingly, it would have realized a deficit of only $1,207,711.40 for the year ended June 30, 1919, and a deficit of only $1,136,989.95 for the six months ended December 31, 1919. On the subway for the year ended June 30, 1920, the company earned above all operating expenses, taxes and fixed charges $2,630,953.75.

On the elevated lines the company incurred a deficit of $4,866,789.44 above operating expenses, taxes, interest and rentals. This deficit was due to the guaranteed dividend of 7% on the $60,000,000 capital stock. This deficit consumed the surplus on the subway and left a total deficit for the company as a whole amounting to $2,235,835.69. The returns realized from the subway have been much more than consumed by the elevated lines.

The collapse of the New York Railways Company was due to its overcapitalization, the excessive rentals and the

high interest paid. The company was organized in 1911, following a receivership which had continued since 1907. The financial collapse in that year was due to the tremendous overcapitalization that had been put upon the system with fixed charges that could not be borne. The reorganization in 1911, however, did not cut down the securities to the reasonable earning value of the property, but continued most of the overcapitalization and extravagant leases, so that the company never did operate at a safe margin above its fixed charges. It was bound to collapse with the increase in operating expenses following the beginning of the war. The company cannot be reorganized upon a solvent basis at any rate of fare, unless it is stripped clean of all excessive rentals and overcapitalization. Many of the properties operated by the New York Railways Company had been leased from other companies. The leases were made during the late eighties and during the nineties. The rentals paid in a number of cases consisted of the interest on the bonds and guaranteed dividends running as high as 21% upon the capital stock. In no instance had the amount of the rentals ever been earned prior to the lease, but the amounts then fixed have been continued and were the principal cause of the receiverships in 1907 and 1919.

The New York Railways Company has paid out every cent it could in dividends and at every step added the maximum amount of securities that the system could possibly stand. It is this fact that has been the fundamental cause of the insolvency of the surface lines in Manhattan. With the development of rapid transit, the company has lost practically all its long and moderate distance traffic, and has left only the short haul business which will not stand a high rate of fare. With this traffic alone, many of the lines can never be made to pay at any rate of fare, and they are practically obsolete and worthless. For this reason the lines cannot be reorganized on a solvent basis unless the new capitalization excludes all obsolete properties and includes only lines which can be made self-supporting.

The investigation of the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company also disclosed some startling facts. It was admitted by the company that there had been in existence a mysterious organization called the Transit Development Company. This organization has been used not only to mulct the public, but the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company itself as well as its subsidiary lines. It had the power to handle real estate and lease the plants of the company. It could also sell back power to the Brooklyn Rapid Transit and its subsidiaries at any rate it saw fit to charge and engaged in many other lines of business that were a constant drain to railway corporation. In sixteen years of its existence this Transit Development Company earned almost $4,000,000, or 7,500% on its capital stock. And still the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company complains that it cannot meet expenses on a five-cent fare while those of the company who are in the inside circle of the Transit Development Company are drawing unheard of dividends which they want to continue from the hard earned nickels wrung from the people.

In fact, the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Company could not wait for a decision by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment on its appeal for higher fares, but succeeded in having its system disintegrated into its original lines on which separate five-cent fares are being charged, although these lines are operated over the Brooklyn Rapid Transit tracks, the same men are employed in the operation of the same cars, the same plant and the same equipment are used, and all the nickels go to the same set of officials and help pay the $131,000 salary and expenses of the receiver for the work he has done in behalf of all the lines and sections of lines.

Now what is the constructive remedy for the present transit crisis in the City of New York?

The Board of Estimate and Apportionment is able to handle the transit problem in the City of New York and handle it in the interest of the people. If the Board had been given a free hand there would be no problem. Despite

the complications and the handicaps which the traction ring has thrown around the street car systems in New York City the present municipal administration has done all it could to relieve the situation.

Since September 21, 1919, before being stopped by court order, forty-six bus routes were established throughout all boroughs of the city and some seventy-five million passengers carried. The flexibility of the bus service was effectively demonstrated. In the case of the railroad strike in August, 1919, in the Borough of Brooklyn, the city assembled and put into operation about two thousand buses within twenty-four hours.

While it is not the province or the purpose of the city to make money out of bus operation, the primary purpose being service to the public, practical experience and close study of the operation properly supervised convince me that the city will earn a substantial profit out of bus operation. On the basis of the first hundred buses operated, it is estimated that a profit of $137,532 per annum will accrue to the city, and subsequent experience verify this calculation. The ratio will hold good for a larger operation. It is therefore estimated that with a thousand buses meeting the transportation necessities of the public, there will accrue the sum of $1,375,320.

This municipally operated bus service could be supplemented by municipal operation of the subways at a five-cent fare. With municipal operation of the subways and buses we would soon be able to turn money into the city treasury. These funds would help to reduce taxation. Moreover, these funds would help to pay off the city's obligations issued for rapid transit purposes, and permit the initiation of necessary public improvements such as schools, hospitals, highways and parks, without further burdening the people by taxation. Money from these sources of municipal operation would then be expended in the interest of all the people and not used for the purpose of enriching a select few.

LIVING AMERICAN STATESMEN: HENRY CABOT LODGE

By ARTHUR FELL LOW

DR. HENRY CABOT LODGE is the senior and pervading senator from Massachusetts in the American Senate. He is a tall, thin gentleman with scoffing eyes and what is described in the press as a quite smile. The smile is at best a mask. Behind it one cannot but feel that there lurks a melancholy Jacques; indeed one's first impression is decidedly that Mr. Lodge is early 1500; that given a poniard, clothed in doublet and hose, he would be infinitely more at home in the camp or court of Francois le Premier or Charles the Fifth than he is representing the great American-Irish Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. Lodge has the distinct attractions of a person of another age. It is interesting to observe his fellow senators treat him with that strained familiarity that would be natural to a group of men who knew that they had among them one who viewed them all with the Christian tolerance of a murder of the *quatro cento*.

This frankly is the impression of the leader of the American Senate. With closer study one learns that the historical air is nothing more than what another senate, one coming from the breezy West, described as the "Boston chill." The exclusiveness of Mr. Lodge and his family was explained to me with great care by one of his associates. Up to the time that he came to the Senate Mr. Lodge and his family held social converse only with their first cousins, a neighboring family by the name of Cabot, and this family, it was said, was so extremely morose and conservative that for

quite long periods of time their sole conversation was that which in the form of prayer they had with their Maker.

Arrived in Washington it became necessary for Mr. Lodge to talk to many people with whom he could naturally have very little sympathy, and it was this situation that brought to his face the now famous smile, for Mr. Lodge did not fail to see the humor of the situation.

Mr. Lodge's leadership in the Senate has come to him most naturally, all of his predecessors having died. Following the wisdom of Comte de Buffy he has learned that the most perfect strategy lies in living longer than your adversary He has therefore entered into his leadership with a mellow grimness arising from the consciousness of having deserved all that he had attained, and of being a living demonstration of the fact that those who might have disputed the title with him have irrevocably demonstrated their referred incapacity and unfitness.

Up to the time that Mr. Wilson became President of the Republic Mr. Lodge was, at least in the Senate, one of the group of men in America who might be counted on to be friendly to Great Britain. Mr. Wilson's open friendship speedily alienated Mr. Lodge, so much so that during the political controversy among the politicians as to whether America would join the League of Nations, Mr. Lodge became friendly with the Irish leaders and even spoke of some of them privately in quite high terms. Strangly, this has not alienated his constituency in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts which, with succeeding years, has become more and more pro-Irish, and has even led to his being called "Boss," which, in America, is a political term of affection as much as of power. This association, it is said, has led to his assuming a more genial or "human" attitude toward his colleagues and constituency, although he still remains an overseer of Harvard University. Had Mr. Wilson come into his life earlier, Mr. Lodge would have been President of the Republic.

Mr. Lodge has a decided literary side and, unlike most American statesmen, he has published quite a number of books which he has written himself. His writings are the better part of him, for here he is without reserve, without that association which has so interferred with his political career.

Years ago I saw a delightful farce in Paris in which an American "entered," the stage directions reading that his waistcoat should be unbuttoned, his hat on the back of his head and his hands in his pockets. Mr. Lodge is the direct antithesis of the type. He is always faultlessly dressed and his hands never have been even in anyone else's pockets, for he represents that small minority, the American lawyer who has arrived at the Senate without having represented a corporation or an interest. Indeed, he is a *rare avis* in American life, a student of law entitled to practice at the bar, who has never availed himself of that royal road to wealth. This distinction is due to the fact that he came of a family of means, although one of his conferres gave the additional reason for his not having practiced on the ground that in this way he avoided addressing the juries, which are most promiscuously made up.

Perhaps the most unfortunate thing that Mr. Lodge ever did from the point of view of the analytic politician of America was to write the life of his great grandfather, George Cabot. This gentleman was one of the last and bitterest leaders of the Federalist party and presided at the Hartford Convention in 1814, where these loyal descendants of Englishmen considered having Massachusetts secede from the Union. Although it was in New England that the original revolt against the mother country began, and although the men of Massachusetts were the first and most ardent advocates of separation, the new Republic once established, it was in New England that there was the greatest opposition to the pernicious democratic theories of Jefferson.

Affected by his residence in France the author of the Declaration of Independence was a believer in unfettered democracy and strongly anti-English. Later in life he saw the error of his ways, but the damage was already done and the conservative party, or Federalist party as it was called, believing in a rule by an educated minority had been swept out of existence and for many years its name was anathema. There was enough talent in young Lodge and enough sense of mischief, as shown by his own story of his turning over a statue in his father's garden and then blaming his boy companion, to have made him a great leader of democracy. But his early manhood was affected by his own cultured ancestors and he carried into his national politics the remnants of a political belief that America had passed irrevocably away from him.

While Roosevelt lived Lodge was necessarily overshadowed, for that robust personality had all the culture that Lodge possessed, together with a fellowship with the great mass of his American citizens which was missing in the Yankee statesman. After Roosevelt died Lodge should have been the leader of the Republican party and should have been nominated for President. But his dislike for acrimonious discussion allowed other men to take the leadership away from him, and his unwillingness, and perhaps his inability, to negotiate with the politicians left him outside the political pale.

Another term from Woodrow Wilson, I am told, might have stirred him to that bitter definiteness that is so essential to success in American life and that is so characteristic of the Western states and statesmen who now dominate the Republican party. It is even to be presumed that had Mr. Wilson's health remained good Mr. Lodge by reason of his intellectual qualities would have naturally become his chief antagonist, especially if Mr. Wilson had undertaken to be a candidate for a third term, which I understand was a possibility at one time.

In studying Mr. Lodge one comes to an understanding of the interesting schism that exists within the Republican party due to the endeavor of the eastern or conservative wing to dominate the western or progressive group. The Eastern senators have maintained their power by their great culture as a rule and also by their readiness and willingness and understanding of the wishes of the great interests. The Republican party owed its existence to the extension of the theories of Jefferson that all human beings had rights. But the slavery question once settled, there came to the fore in it a group of men principally easterners and political descendants of the Federalists who had no more understanding of Lincoln than had Gladstone, and these have been in the Senate the defenders of property rights against what the westerners term human rights.

Nevertheless, it is to the credit of Senator Lodge, and interesting in view of the fact that this question is about to be revived, that he has been one of those who have fought the disenfranchisement of the Negro in the South. In June, 1890, Mr. Lodge was a member of the House of Representatives when that body reported out the Federal Election Bill, which was known as the Force Bill because it threatened to use the Federal forces to protect the Negroes against intimidation at the polls.

"We have clothed the Negroes with the attributes of American citizenship," he said in explaining his attitude. "We have put in their hands the emblem of American sovereignity. Whether wisely or unwisely done is of no consequence now; it has been done and it is irrevocable. The government which made the black man a citizen of the United States is bound to protect him in his rights as a citizen of the United States and it is a cowardly government if it does not do it."

Although the Senate at that time was Republican and there was a Republican president the Eastern or Federalist wing was in control and this bill was killed in the Senate.

What is most lamented by students of American affairs is that without unusually rich personality, and one of rare charm, with a background of great variety and scholarship, Mr. Lodge will leave so comparatively little impression on American life. His own enjoyment of the intellectual has been carried to the point of self-indulgence—a New England rather than an American characteristic.

Of all living American statesmen, one cannot help but feel that Mr. Lodge is the most scholarly, the best read and the ablest. In the Versailles conference he would have saved Europe as well as America many lamented mistakes. Had he been less of the Hamiltonian he might in his own country have achieved its greatest honor, and had he been president he undoubtedly have ranked with Washington, Lincoln and Roosevelt, the three greatest of American statesmen.

BEAUTY SHALL BE UNTO ME A DREAM

By HELEN FRAZEE-BOWER

For Beauty shall be unto me a dream
That waking or asleep the eye discerns
And follows still—the Midas-touch that turns
The Face of things that are to things that seem.
Not light itself, but those far rays that gleam
Beyond the circle where a white star burns,
Not sight nor sound, but something mute that yearns
For self-expression in the great scheme.

Aye, Beauty is the buried seed that sleeps
And dreams the soul to blossom. Beauty lives
Not here nor there, but evermore she keeps
The goal beyond for which the dreamer strives;
The vision that eludes, the silent word,
The sight unseen, the something never heard.

MUTATIONS IN HUMAN PROGRESS

By JOHN CANDEE DEAN, SC.D.

DURING the past fifty years we have greatly extended our knowledge of the early history of both civilized and archaic man. Formerly we depended on written records handed down from generation to generation; now we have unearthed the records of man that were compiled before the time of classical civilization, and from discoveries in archæology and paleontology are reconstructing his unwritten history extending back many thousands of years.

These records show that man's advancement has been made by mutations. There have been successive periods of civilization, separated by epochs of barbarism. Each succeeding race has had its beginning, flourished, decayed and died. There is but little evidence to support the common prevailing idea that Nature has a blind tendency toward universal progress. It is true that the higher forms of life were developed from the lower forms, but it does not follow that development is always progressive, and that Nature assures us of continuous human advancement.

In many instances prehistoric forms of life have been extinguished with startling suddenness. The archaic mammals met their fate largely through competition, induced by the incursion of later orders, but the prime cause was the fluctuating climate. The ancestors of man, the primates, had many narrow escapes. It is a historical fact that they were wholly extinguished in North America. The Pleistocene period was a time of wholesale extinctions, when races of animals were blotted out, but man by his superior

mental attributes was able to survive and took his place as the dominant form of life.

The age of man, beginning when the ape-man acquired traits which we call human, extends to a period of hundreds of thousands of years. It is impossible to comprehend the slowness of the processes involved in biological evolution. The oldest known fossil remains of man were found in Trinal, on the island of Java in 1894. This Java ape-man is estimated to have lived about 500,000 years ago. The oldest known European remains are those of the Heidelburg man, discovered in 1907; estimated age about 350,000 years.

The Neanderthal man lived perhaps 50,000 years ago, and the Crô-Magnon cave men about 25,000 years ago. They were a splendid race, with large brain capacity. The Crô-Magnon's are examples of an ancient race, with artistic culture, who faded away. A parallel may here be seen with certain civilized races, within historic times, who developed high artistic and industrial culture, followed by a period of decline to barbarism.

Not until the present generation have we secured the culmination of knowledge which enables us to trace the development from the ape-man of Java through ages of struggle to the Crô-Magnon man of Southern France, and then through the vicissitudes of civilization in Egypt, the Orient, and Europe, to the highly developed man of today.

Man by reason of his superior intelligence, and communal cooperation, is no longer subject to the laws which govern the adaptation of animals to their environment. It is probable that man's physical evolution has virtually ceased. In fact, his physical drift is possibly retrogressive. There is a strong tendency toward dullness of the senses of sight, smell and hearing. These are the senses which the wild animals depend on for their safety. The reduction of the hair and teeth are also indications of human physical retrogressive tendencies. Modern charity which fosters the physically, mentally and morally unfit, must in time have a

very adverse effect on the race. Man's future progress will be due to his dominant mental superiority.

All human progress is intellectual. The social value of any group of men is in proportion to the mental capacity of a few individuals of superior intellectual power. Natural events occur regardless of man's interests, and progress is due to individual variation. Society, institutions and everything that exists are the product of evolution. The ancient Babylonians and the Etruscans were familiar with the fact that races had their periods of development and decay. Etruscans had their *great* period during 1100 years which came to an end about 87 B.C. in the turbulent time of Sulla. The celebrated English Egyptologist, Flinders Petrie, declares that: "In Egypt we can trace the past of man in continuous history for over seven thousand years, and can put in order a prehistoric age which may extend our view to about ten thousand years. Over the whole of that time we know what were the products of every century. Here, then, the discoveries of the last twenty years have put in our hands a series, which is sufficient to enable us to compare periods together, and learn what they may have in common." He then proceeds to show, that in the long range of vision between 6000 B.C. to the nineteenth century, there can be described six successive periods of high civilization, each followed by a period of decline to barbarism.

The distinctive art of Egypt appeared in the second dynastic period (4500 B.C.) which was followed by a dark age, and in the early third dynasty art was very rude, but at the close of the third dynasty the rise in art was rapid, and a nearly perfect art in sculpture was developed. Later there arose the great age of pyramid builders.

The pyramid of Gizah, the tomb of Cheops, built in the thirtieth century B.C., is still the largest stone superstructure of ancient or modern times. Here is the most conclusive surviving evidence of man's emergence from barbarism, and it is a witness of the far-reaching effect of organized government controlled by authority. It contains 2,300,000

blocks of stone, each weighing two and a half tons. In the sepulchre are several dressed stones weighing fifty tons each. Many of the stones are thought to have been sawed into shape with copper saws set with black diamonds.

One quarter mile east of the great pyramid is the colossus of the Sphinx, which for fifty centuries has been the wonder of the world. It represents the head of a king on the body of a crouching lion. It is carved from the living rock, and is one hundred and forty feet in length. The face looks toward the rising sun, and, in spite of mutilations, still expresses sovereign strength with calm dignity.

The dark age which preceded the rise of the great pyramid builders, is described by an Egyptian writer called Apuur. It appears that a soviet government, much like the present one in Russia, was under trial. The following is taken from "Literature of Ancient Egypt" (1914) by Sir E. A. Wallis Budge, the learned keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities of the British Museum.

An Egyptian writer called Apuur of the XIth dynasty (about 3400 B.C.) describes the terrible state of the Egyptians in consequence of the anarchy into which Egypt had fallen. The Papyrus in which these observations are written is preserved in Leyden (No. 1344). It states that the peasants of the Delta had armed themselves.

> "The honest man is grieved because of what had happened in the country. Men who go out to play take their shields with them. The Nile had flooded the fields, but few went out to play. Poor men have obtained valuable goods. The slaves are sad, and the nobles no longer participate in the rejoicings of the people. The gentle-folks weep, the simple folks are glad, and the people from every town say: 'Come, let us blot out those who have power and possessions among us.' The river is blood, and men drink it. The boats of the people of the South have failed to arrive, the towns are destroyed, and Upper Egypt is a desert. A gentleman cannot be distinguished from the common man. Noble ladies and slave girls suffer alike, and the children of princes are dashed against the wall.
>
> "The laws of the court-house are rejected, men trample on them in public, and the poor break them in the street. Things are now done that never were done before, for a party of miserable men have removed the king. Men resemble mud birds, filth is everywhere, and everybody is clothed in dirty garments."

Apuur appeals to the people to destroy the enemies of the sacred palace. He seems to fortell the coming of a king who will restore prosperity; who will be the shepherd of mankind, with no evil in his heart.

He further describes the results of the revolution. The occupants of the tombs have been thrown out, and the man who could not make a coffin for himself has converted a tomb into a treasury. "Men who had fine clothes are now in rags, and he who never wore clothes before, is now dressed in fine linen. Noble ladies go hungry, while butchers are sated with what was once prepared for them. Multitudes are buried in the river, the stream is a tomb and the place of mummification is a canal. There is a plague everywhere, blood is in every place, death is common and mummy wrappings call to people before they are used."

The period of the building of the great tomb at Gizeh was remarkable for its development of the sumptuous work of the goldsmith and lapidary, which has seldom, perhaps never, been equaled in modern times. Two hundred years after the building of the great pyramid of Gizeh, and only a few miles farther up the Nile, the royal architects exhibited remarkable creative powers by producing the earliest form of columns with foliage capitals, in the colonnade of the temple of Sahure. The culmination of the architect's art, however, occurred in the thirteenth century B.C. by the construction of the Karnak Clerestory Hall with its gigantic colonnades.

It is said that as far back as 4242 B.C. the Egyptians had the most accurate system of chronology ever devised by the ingenuity of man. The length of the year was measured by the heliacal rising of the dog star, Sirius. Each year, when Sirius was first seen to rise before the sun, the length of the year was measured. Sirius then rose heliacally, in the latitude of Heliopolis, about July 19th. Their year began at the winter solstice (December 22nd) called the first day of Troth. They found the year to have 365¼ days. The winter solstice is really the scientific beginning point

of the year. They divided the year into twelve months of thirty days each, and to the last month five intercalary days were added. Instead of adding one day to the calendar every fourth year, they added a month at the end of 120 years, called Hanis. While this was a purely astronomical system of chronology, it must not be assumed that they had any accurate knowledge of astronomy. Their astronomy was geocentric, and therefore a false system.

By 2000 B.C. the resources and forces which had expanded Egyptian life and power to a height never before attained by any nation, were exhausted and prostrated. The invasion of the Shepherd Kings followed. Petrie says: "The later stages of this period are lost in the darkness of civil confusion and decay, and finally closed with the Hyksos invasion."

About 3000 B.C. the work of the Nile artizans found its way across the Mediterranean to the island of Crete where the first European civilization was developed and a new written language evolved. A similar development of human progress had taken place in Western Asia by the Babylonians was later than that of the Nile and earlier than that of Crete. The art of warfare here reached a stage far superior to that of Egypt. The arts of peace had been developed in Egypt, those of war in Babylonia.

Babylonia was elevated to the leadership of Western Asia about 2100 B.C. Their code of laws exhibit the remarkable organization of commercial art, architecture, and business interest, which contributed to the growth of civilization and wealth of the world. In the eighth century B.C. the Assyrian Kings had gained control of the Babylonian Empire and were expanding its boundaries in all directions. Iron had long been worked by the Hittites, and the fierce soldiers of the Assyrians were armed with terrible weapons of iron.

The wonderful Cretan civilization was overwhelmed and obliterated, about 1200 B.C. by the ancestors of the Greeks, who came through the passes of the Balkans, oc-

cupying southern Greece. They were then barbarians little advanced beyond the Stone Age. Breasted tells us that the drawing on Greek pottery of 800 B.C. was not so good as that of the Crô-Magnon cave men of France who lived 25,000 years earlier.

The leading factor in man's civilization has been shown to arise from the discovery and use of metals. They have widened the scope of human endeavor, elevated the arts, given to man that courage and power which lead to great enterprises.

The Egyptians were the inventors of copper implements and thus inaugurated the age of metals. The first step toward higher civilization was made when copper was discovered, and copper tools and weapons made. Before the discovery of copper, the ore called malachite had been used as an ingredient for face paint. If, by chance, some of the malachite had dropped into charcoal fire, its melting would have resulted in a bead of pure copper; it is also possible that pieces of virgin copper may have been found. Gold was known before copper. It is the most universally distributed of all metals and occasionally occurs in nuggets of virgin gold that may be beaten out into bars.

In war, an immense and decisive advantage was given to nations whose armies were equipped with metal spears, swords and shields. They were coinscious that victory was sure to attend their struggle in battle against those whose arms were of stone. The invention of metal tools gave the Egyptian craftsmen mastery over the hardest materials, and in the pyramid age this newly acquired power caused them to run riot in stone work.

The use of iron came after the final collapse of the wonderful Egyptian civilization. While iron was discovered as far back as the thirteenth century B.C., a knowledge of it spread slowly. The Assyrians were the first to equip their great armies with weapons of iron which enabled them to triumph over their enemies. They developed a great civilization. Their architecture was wonderful and the first

known great library of Asia was in the palace at Nineveh, written in cuneiform characters. This library was centuries older than the oldest library of the Greeks.

Weapons of iron divorced men from peaceful pursuits, and before the time of Homer the great wave of the Dorian invasion swept over Greece and engulfed it in darkness. The Dorians were armed with weapons of iron. As letters died out, swords of iron increased in length. The Homeric poems depict an age of transition, which is typified by the change from bronze to iron. A proof occurs in Homer, where a mass of iron is mentioned as one of the prizes at the funeral games of Patroclus.

Within the limits of this article, it is only possible to discuss a few of the leading examples in history, which illustrate the mutation in human progress. As the Assyrian civilization declined that of Greece rapidly developed, culminating about 450 B.C., and surpassing the previous highest stage of Egyptian culture. The descent from Greek and Roman enlightenment to the barbarism of the dark ages is the most familiar example of the decline and suspension of social development. It marks the barbaric period between ancient and modern times. The fifth century saw the dismemberment of the Roman Empire. Western Europe was torn from the imperial mold and broken up. From the fifth to the tenth century there was no progress in Europe. According to Petrie this was the sixth recurrent dark period of Mediterranean civilization. The last dark age finally crystallized into feudalism, and, in the eleventh century, a revival of learning, wealth, art and manners began.

The scholastacism of the Middle Ages was verbose rubbish, Medieval thought was unscientific and uncritical. There was little lost in the arts of ancient Egypt, and especially in the liberal arts, engineering and mechanics, which would have been of value to us. Tales of the lost arts including that of hardening copper are without evidence of truth. Ancient Egyptian chisels for dressing stone have been found and tested, physically and chemically.

Some of their copper was hard because of its natural alloys, but the common method of hardening the edge of copper tools, probably was by hammering. After the discovery of tin, it was used for hardening copper by mixing the two metals. Such alloys are called bronze.

Within the last century, we made greater progress in acquiring real knowledge of the world, and in grasping its nature, than in all past ages. Our only real and valuable knowledge is that of Nature herself. She is secretive and does not voluntarily reveal her attributes. They have to be wrung from her by laborious observations. We search for explanation of observed natural phenomenon, through the discovery of cause, and demand of casuality an answer in reason. Science is the intellectual autocrat of modern life and thought.

The application of electricity and chemistry to thousands of useful purposes has given the twentieth century the stamp of the Electro-Chemical Age. The production and use of metals is still the leading factor in the power and progress of nations. Without the application of chemistry to metallurgy there would have been little progress in steel development. Bessemer was the first to produce chemical steel, and his own large fortune was but a very small fraction of the enormous wealth which his invention gave to the world.

Flinders Petrie expresses the belief that one cause of the decline in civilization is that a gradual transformation to a social democracy takes place. The following opinion was written by him ten years ago:

> "When democracy has attained full power, the majority without capital necessarily eat up the capital of the minority, and the civilization steadily decays, until the inferior population is swept away to make room for a fitter people. The consumption of all the resources of the Roman empire, from the second century when democracy was dominant, until the Gothic kingdom arose on its ruin, is the best-known example in detail. Such is the regular connection of the farms of government, or the relation of classes which is inherent in the conditions of the revolutions of civilizations."

Is the splendid civilization of Europe strong enough to withstand the shock of reaction resulting from her great war? Do the events occurring in Russia, and the spread of Bolshevism, portend a downward movement toward another dark age in Europe? Are the powers of the individual to make the most of himself, to be suppressed by unreasoning, collective ochloracies? Remember that every discovery by which human relationship has been improved, by which the civilization of man has progressed has been produced by the creative power of the individual, never by the power of a combination of men. The great discoveries that have opened up new fields of improvement, elevated human thought or action, have been created by the private judgment of bold and able individuals.

No nation has been eminent in art, literature, and learning which was not first great in commerce and wealth. Sometimes the fading of civilization has been caused by the extinction of property rights, through invasion, or revolution, or both. Civilization itself rests on the security of private property. No country, whatever its natural resources, whatever the intellectual endowments of its people, can be prevented from sinking to barbarism, unless private property is secure. Where a people are protected in the enjoyment of things created by their industry, and saved by their frugality, regardless of destructive wars and heavy taxes, *they* will advance in commerce, art, wealth and power.

THE SEASON OF SYMPHONY

By CHARLES HENRY MELTZER

IN winter, New York used to crave for opera. It raved about old stars and even new ones. It stared, night after night, at glittering boxes filled with bored men and rich, self-conscious women. It made believe to discriminate between Verdi and Puccini. It grew hot about the wickedness of "Salome," and the voluptuous charm of "Tristan and Isode." It tried its utmost to sit through the whole of "Parsifal" and swore by "Carmen."

The opera was the chief glory of the season, the test of culture and the magnet which drew fashion. Not to have heard the very latest singer, great or small, at the Metropolitan was to have proved oneself a rank and poor outsider. The smart folk babbled about "Geraldine" and Caruso, as, before them, a more critical generation had talked of "Jean" and Calvé. Times changed and stars who once seemed bright grew pale. But the passion for grand opera did not change, and few of us were musical enough to see that, slowly but surely, it was losing its old grip upon the public.

And why? Because the singers of the day, though applauded like more wonderful forerunners, were, with the one exception of the admired Caruso, not really stars, but, well, just singers, or good actors and interpreters, of whom some had worn-out voices. Most opera-goers knew this fact subconsciously yet even they felt only a vague disenchantment, an odd absence of illusion, when they were listening to performances of works which once seemed magical.

This disenchantment may, to some extent at least, explain the strange and frenzied interest shown this season in the metropolis in concert music. Since last November there has been less eager interest in opera and a development, in an

amazing way, of what we call pure music. Within six months our local Symphony Orchestras, together with five out of town societies, will have wiped out all previous records, here or elsewhere, by giving New York not a hundred, but, if statistics do not err, two hundred and thirty good symphonic concerts.

In order to keep pace with these performances, our weary music critics will have had to attend nine symphonic functions weekly, besides heaven only knows how many recitals and performances by chamber-music artists.

If the policeman's lot is not a happy one, what of the critics? How can the most fervent lover of pure music not rebel at such a plethora of tuneful art? The layman is not forced to hear more than he wants of symphony. But the poor critic has to listen to it all, or to as much as the perpetual clash of concerts and the rest—including opera—allow one mortal to drink in each day.

In other times, New York had two Societies devoted to the cult of symphony. The older of the two, the Philharmonic, had as its only steady rival the important New York Symphony Orchestra. There were, indeed, some minor organizations, but they were not of vital moment or significance. Then, one by one, the ambitious orchestras of Boston, Chicago, Philadelphia, Minneapolis and, more recently, of Detroit, began at intervals to visit the metropolis and, to the New York and Philharmonic groups, about one year ago, was added a third local rival.

At the outset it was known as the New Symphony. It has this season been re-named the National. Between this body and the existing local and outside societies a mad, incessant war is now in progress. Day after day, night after night, week after week, Mr. Stransky, Mr. Bodansky, Mr. Damrosch, Mr. Stock, Mr. Oberhoeffer, Mr. Monteux, Mr. Stokowski and Mr. Gabrilovitch, the conductors of these orchestras, have vied with one another in directing fine performances of symphony. And, as if they were inadequate to the present thirst and hunger for pure music, a foreign

maëstro, Mr. Toscanini, has brought from Milan a ninth orchestra.

But the outcome of this sudden growth of music has, except perhaps in the instance of one orchestra long famous here, been not the financial crash of all the warring groups but a vast increase of the concert-going public. How long the current craze for symphony will last no one can tell. It may prove to have been a passing fad. It may, however, have more permanence.

In any case it will have helped to spread a taste for higher things than musical comedy; "grand opera" may be hit if the concerts go on drawing crowds as they now do. One good result of the big concert war may be an improvement in the quality of opera. Heaven knows there is much need of a reform both in the singers at the Metropolitan and in the attitude of their far too patient audiences. The art of song, the art and style of lyric drama, in our leading opera house, are not today what they were years ago.

Our symphony conductors, all of them, are on their mettle, full of fire and zeal. They are struggling for artistic recognition and for more than that—for the existence of their several orchestras. The backers of pure music, in the past, have not been selfish. They have been prompted by quite altruistic motives. The Flaglers, Mackays, de Coppet, Pulitzers and other wealthy persons who have been behind our great symphony organizations have all aspired, not to make money for themselves, but to spread taste. It is not to win social recognition that they have given money and bequeathed more money to institutions like the New York and Philharmonic orchestras. Some have been prompted by their own real love of symphony, while some, less musical, have wished to promote a gracious art which, as they knew, is beautiful and uplifting. The boxes in our concert halls are dimly lit. They do not make a good background for rich costumes. The eyes of those who meet to hear performances of Bach and Beethoven are fixed upon the platform, not the boxes. The conductor and the musicians in

the orchestra mean vastly more to the supporters of our concerts than all the New York millionaires together. Pure music has this advantage over opera. It does not foster vulgar snobbishness. It has some other merits. It rests the jaded mind and yet it quickens and awakes imagination. It may not be so exciting as grand opera. But, *en revanche*, it stirs up poetry and fancy in the responsive listener.

For, even if one reads the program notes, one is not bound and fettered by what they may say of the meanings and mysteries of the music. A hundred persons, who may hear a symphony, may find a hundred different meanings in that work. The most learned commentators on the great closing movement in the "Choral" long wrangled as to whether it was a grand ode to Peace or Joy. At times, of course, the composers have supplied meanings. But, even then, those who enjoy their works may choose to read quite other things into the tones, the themes and rhythms of composers. Those program notes, however, sometime help. It is well to know, before we hear the "Fantastic," for example, that when he wrote it, Hector Berlioz was in love with Henrietta Smithson, and that a certain *leit-motif*, or theme, which is repeated many times in that weird symphony, expresses the idea of his beloved. Nor can it harm one to be frequently reminded that in his C-minor, Beethoven suggested Fate. We need no program notes, however, for the "Unfinished," the Brahms symphonies, and countless other works. We prefer to let our fancy roam at large when we are revelling in most symphonies and tone-poems.

The present passion for great concert music must do good, by arousing our imaginative faculties and by attuning many dull and careless ears to what the Bard has called "the concord of sweet sounds." It must help us in our judgment of "grand" opera, which really often is less "grand" than symphony. A short course of concert music may refine our taste, make us more sensitive as to false notes and slip-shod style. It cannot fail to make us much more critical when we are listening to "Aida" or "Louise."

And symphony is fairly free from the reproach that purists sometimes hurl at opera. Although emotional, being the expression of emotion, it seldom deals with lust and crime and other kindred themes of opera. It sings serenely or tempestuously, it rarely conjures up revolting images. It voices sorrow, joy, despair, and doubt. But it suggests them all in tones and terms of beauty. No mind, however sensitive, could be sullied by Strauss and Liszt's most lurid concert poems. Most symphony is subjective, not objective —expressing feedings born in the soul of the composer. Our feelings, as we listen, may be different. Yet, in a way, we may still understand, in part at least, what moved the composer to create his music. To quite realize the significance it had, say, to a man like Beethoven, must be impossible, unless the listener is himself a Beethoven.

We can be told too much about even "program" music, like the London symphony of Vaughan William, which somehow only now and then seemed to suggest what it attempted to convey to us. Vaughan Williams, if we may believe the statements printed to explain his purpose, wished to interpret for us the various moods and aspects of his native London. He had attempted hints at Holborn and the Strand, at the backwaters of Bloomsbury and the slums beyond the Thames at Westmnister. What he suggested was much more indefinite. Some passages he had written far from evoking English sums and slummy revels, took one in fancy to the noisy streets of Naples. Those program notes were largely wasted effort in the case I mention. They were more needed in the instances of some other works performed this season. We should have been more than glad to know what various friends inspired Elgar's variations in his "Enigma."

A special impetus has been lent to symphony by the visits of three masterful conductors to New York. Holland has sent us William Mengelberg of the Concertgebouw; England has added Albert Coates of the London Symphony and Covent Garden Opera House; while Italy has restored to

us Toscanini. The advent of authorities like these has put new life into our orchestras and incited them to unheard of emulation. It has also had its influence on the public. For our three visitors are all celebrities, as famous in their way as Muratore, Mary Garden and Caruso. Each is a man of power and personality, with remarkable achievements to his credit. In their appearance and their methods they differ strikingly. Toscanini has the outer fragility of a reed, with the inner heat of a consuming flame. He impresses one by his avoidance of sensationalism, his quiet manner and his great distinction. His hands are eloquent. They almost speak. His gestures as a rule are most discreet, though they suggest the biddings of a despotic mind. As one looks at this slim, unassuming maestro, one find it hard at first to understand how passionate he can be, and how heroic.

Yet Toscanini once, they say, was put on trial for almost blinding one of his musicians who had incensed him by his careless playing. And Toscanini had done nobler things. He had dared the Austrian hordes at Monte Santo. But from the moment when he left his baton, one sees how utterly he commands his fellowers. He has no need of violent gestures to dominate and inspire his orchestra. The slightest movement of his hands brings a response. Only in building up some mighty climax does he depart from his habitual calm. He has incredible, exquisite delicacies. As to his readings of some famous symphonies, opinions differ. And, on the whole, he impresses some of us less favorably as an interpreter of classic concert music than as the conductor of great lyric dramas. He is apt to over-emphasize minor details and under-emphasize others much more vital. But, at the end of the C-minor symphony of Beethoven, at New York's Metropolitan, he enchanted us by his poetry and virility.

The Dutch Mengelberg is the antithesis of the Italian—a short and stocky but unusual leader of resolute will and wonderful authority. His face, his lips, his eyes are full

of temperament. His forehead, crowned by curly, tumbled hair, tells of intellect. In Amsterdam, his home, the great little Mengelberg has long been idolized. So far he has not dabbled much in opera. His field is symphony. He interprets, with the same assured authority, the romantic and the classic styles in music. The composers he prefers, it seems, are Strauss and Gustav Mahler. But he is equally at home in Brahms and Beethoven, in Débussy, César Franck and Hector Berlioz. It was the "Fantastic" of the last-named French composer he chose to interpret when he made his first appearance in control of the National Symphony some time ago. And he missed nothing of the fire, the charm and pathos of that much neglected and strange composition. His rendering of the idyllic pastoral episode (the third movement) would, I believe, not have displeased its inventor. The final scene, in Hell, had the right horror and fantastic thrill. When Mengelberg, before he reached the symphony, interpreted the Straussian "Don Juan" music, somehow partly—even largely—made us indulgent to its tawdry quality. The sonorities which now and then had tired us in that empty work assumed, or seemed to do so, real significance. The sentimental phrases had more beauty than when Strauss created them. We forgot to carp at the composer's *clichés*.

But of the three distinguished visitors who have directed concerts in New York this season, I incline to set the English Coates above his rivals. He has not the bewildering subtleties of the Italian maestro, nor the impeccable sense of rhythm of the Dutchman. But he is broader in his reading than the former and quite as inspiring as the latter—judging him, possibly, too quickly from one concert. This exceptional Englishman is big in many ways. He is strapping, rather unwieldy, and upstanding. His arm and legs are big, too big for grace. And, best of all, his intellect is big. Temperamental to a fault, but with the ability to harness his emotions, to transmit them to his musicians and his audiences. His conducting at the first of the three

concerts he had charge of here electrified the staid New York Symphony orchestra. Although, I think, the best disciplined and musicianly we have today in the United States, until Coates, fired it, as he did, when it interpreted the "Enigma" variations, it had seemed often too scholastically accurate, too unemotional. It took one's breath away to find that it was capable of greater things, that it could charm our hearts as well as please our ears, with music which though agreeable and of course ingenious was not the invention of a mighty genius.

But, just as Mengelberg had uplifted Strauss, Coates with, his temperamental earnestness and rare intelligence transmuted Elgar. This, I should add, occurred at Carnegie Hall, which suited him much better than Aeolian Hall. When he conducted in the smaller concert room we missed a good deal of the alternate strength and charm which we had found in the vast uptown building.

Our famous visitors have had honors showered on them. Yet for some weeks or months before they came, our own conductors had been working tirelessly to spread and foster the new craze for symphony. Damrosch, Bodanzky, Monteux, Stock, Gabrilowitch and more had paved the way for those three guest conductors. Between them all they have done wondrous things for that delightful art we call divine. This season should be marked with a white stone by all of us who love pure concert music.

OUR NEW ARMY

By MAJ.-GEN. W. G. HAAN

THE policy for National Defense, as conceived by Congress, is outlined in Section 3 of the National Defense Act, as amended by the Act of June 4, 1920. The pertinent part of this Section reads as follows:

"Section 3. The organized peace establishment . . . shall include all of those divisions and other military organizations necessary to form the basis for a complete and immediate mobilization for the national defense in the event of a national emergency declared by Congress . . ."

This is really a Congressional mandate upon the War Department to prepare in a specific manner for the national defense. Various other sections of the Act assume to provide the means for accomplishing the result *"necessary to form the basis for a complete and immediate mobilization for the National Defense."* The principal means thus provided are briefly as follows:

A Regular Army of 17,500 officers and 280,000 enlisted men.

The National Guard with maximum expansion by 1924 to 425,000.

The Organized Reserves of indefinite strength.

Immediate and complete mobilization—The Mandate—What does it mean? Does it mean the mobilization of all available military personnel in the United States; or does it mean something else? I think a reasonable interpretation of this provision might be stated as follows:

Mobilization of organized and trained personnel and material in such strength and at such speed as will make reasonably certain that the most powerful probable enemy shall be successfully resisted until the potential military strength of the nation can be developed sufficiently behind this defense to insure ultimate victory.

The foregoing may be taken as the mission which the War Department assumes should be accomplished by the means placed at its disposal under the mandate of Congress already discussed.

The problem calling for solution must ever be indefinite until war actually comes, but a careful study of the world situation, taking into consideration the trend of political events since the Armistice of the Forest of Compiegne, gives us a reasonable basis for an estimate of the situation resulting from the world's political relations. Careful studies have been made by the War Department General Staff covering the world situation as it has developed since the close of the war and it is believed that reasonable conclusions have been reached as to the maximum efforts that could be made by those nations or groups of nations, which might possibly and even most probably become our enemies in wars of the near future, should such wars occur. Our studies have gone so far as to make reasonable estimates of the intensity and speed with which such enemy efforts might be made, and the successful solution of the problem requires that our mobilization must be such and at such speed as will successfully resist the efforts of the enemy. Taking our studies on this line, we have attempted to set the requirements of the problem by showing what force is necessary to have ready to meet the maximum efforts of the enemy at certain definite periods after the day hostilities begin, and based upon these conclusions we have constructed what may be called "The Man-power Curve" showing graphically the rate of increase required in our organized forces taken as a function of time reckoned from the beginning of hostilities.

The peace establishment must be such as to permit of *immediate mobilization* of the necessary force to accomplish the mission as above stated. Mobilization to be *immediately effective* requires that those elements which cannot be provided *during the period of mobilization* must be provided beforehand; must be provided in time of peace; some

of these elements requiring much time in the making may be mentioned as follows:

Trained commanders for the larger units.

The principal staff officers for the larger combat units.

Commanders, staff officers and subordinate officers for all units.

Officers for taking charge of corps areas and undertaking organization and training of the second and subsequent mobilizations.

Reserve equipment and supplies and an organization for mobilizing the industries of the country according to plans previously prepared to supply the field forces with all manner of necessaries *before the reserve supplies are exhausted.*

The man-power curve forms the basis for all preparation. It is the *Directrix* of all activities in preparation for the national defense. It applies not only to personnel, but to material. It is the guide not only for the War Department General Staff, but for the great supply departments of the Army, and our Army school development.

Before approving the man-power curve, the highest authorities of the War Department consulted with other departments of the government, particularly with the Navy Department. This matter is mentioned here merely to show with what care and caution the situation was studied before the man-power curve was accepted.

Having reached conclusions upon the man-power curve, the problem resolved itself into one of concreteness. It was possible then to make intelligent studies as to how best to make use of the means provided by the Congress to accomplish the mission contained in the Congressional Mandate. The essential means provided have already been stated. The best possible development of these means has been considered and studied from every angle. In accordance with the requirements in the National Defense Act, experienced officers of the National Guard and the Reserves have been detailed on duty with the War Department General Staff for the purpose of studying with officers of the War Depart-

ment General Staff the best possible organization for the National Guard and the Organized Reserves. I am glad to state that there has been no difference of opinion between the Regular officers and these National Guard and Reserve Officers in the mission that is to be accomplished by the National Defense force and the best organization for accomplishing that mission with the means made available.

The most important element of an army, and the one that requires the greatest amount of time in the making, is the officer personnel. The various classes of officer personnel as to importance, and as to length of time required in preparation, are as follows:

Commanders and principal staff officers of large units (Above the Regiment).

Commanders and staff officers of subordinate units.

Subaltern officers.

For all those organizations that must be a part of the *immediate mobilization* prescribed by Congress, the entire officer personnel must be provided before the emergency, so that there shall be available, when the emergency is declared by Congress, sufficient officers to at once take charge of troops called into service and to proceed with the organization, concentration and deployment in accordance with the approved war plans.

The officer personnel that should be available by 1924, if fully developed as contemplated, under the present law, would be approximately as follows:

Regular Army	17,500
National Guard, Estimated	28,500
Reserve Corps, Estimated	104,000
Total	150,000

This *in numbers* would be sufficient for a force consisting of fifty-four combat divisions, organized into nineteen corps and six field armies and, in addition thereto, officers for the War Department overhead and the personnel necessary for all the activities in the corps areas and the great supply system.

Under a preceding paragraph are given the various classes of personnel. Those under the first two classes require careful and special training, both theoretical and practical; those under the first class requiring, of course, more than those under the second; those under the third require basic theoretical and practical instruction in a lesser degree.

Our Army School System is being so developed as to give in the Special and General Service Schools the necessary facilities to instruct qualified officers from all available sources provided by law for various classes of officer personnel. This brings us to the mission of our schools for officers. General Orders No. 56, current series, War Department, gives us the mission of schools for officers as follows:

"To provide officers trained correctly in theory and practice for all positions in command and staff for the Peace Establishment of the United States Army as organized under Section 3, Act of June 4, 1920, and to provide in addition thereto a reservoir of trained officers qualified for organizing and developing to its maximum capacity the potential military power of the nation in accordance with the approved war plans."

In order that we may carry out in time of war a complete and immediate mobilization as called for by Congress, we must provide in time of peace an eligible list of commanders and an eligible list of the important staff officers so trained that they shall be immediately available to take charge of this immediate and complete mobilization. This is the principal function of our Army School System for officers.

Officers included in the Regular Army list can be counted upon as definitely available in the near future. Those of the National Guard it is hoped may be maintained at near the maximum. The indefinite problem rests with the Reserves. At the present time and perhaps for five years in the future sufficient Reserve Officers may be obtained from those who saw service in the War to furnish the minimum required for the first mobilization. The National Defense Act makes provision for maintaining the Officers' Reserve Corps by commissioning new reserve officers as the present list gradually ceases to be available. The R. O. T. C.

at Educational Institutions being the principal source. The Civilian Military Training Camps under Section 47d, National Defense Act, should also generate a considerable number; and there are other channels of eligibility. A practical experience alone will determine whether the requisite number with proper qualifications can be obtained.

The enlisted personnel requires less time in the making if officers be available to give the instructions. With the enlisted personnel, as with the officer personnel, the Regular Army contingent peace strength may be counted upon with definiteness. The National Guard with less definiteness and less perfectly trained but fully organized; the Organized Reserve Force is as yet wholly theoretical as to enlisted component—no one can at present foretell with anything better than an estimate as to how this may develop; but in any case, if we are able to maintain the officer personnel in the numbers required in the various grades, by that alone much will have been accomplished, since with the officer personnel the *basis of organization* for war can be made in time of peace. It is the policy of the War Department, as I understand it, not to ask for further legislation unless by actual trial the present law should fail to produce the means whereby the mission, which it clearly describes, can be accomplished.

I have spoken mainly of personnel so far. The War Department plans being prepared under the various provisions of the National Defense Act, as amended, include not only the adequate reserve munitions and equipment of all kinds, but careful studies and plans for the co-ordination and mobilization of the industries necessary to supply the Field Armies with all manner of equipment and munitions as the reserves become exhausted. These studies and plans are all based upon the man-power curve as the general guide.

The careful studies so far made and the policies thereunder in process of development are to be convincing proof that as a piece of constructive legislation involving a broad policy covering the probable needs of National Defense,

this law is by far the best and most rational ever placed on our statute books.

The mandate in Section 3, modestly interpreted by the War Department as its mission, is yet so large an undertaking that the means provided by the law may not be sufficient for its accomplishment. There are many of our best informed both inside and outside the Army who believe that universal training alone will be sufficient. The earnest and honest effort now being made should before long give us definite and sufficient information for intelligent recommendations as to necessary or desirable modifications.

VOICES

By BERT LEACH

Woe brims the wide, deep world; wherefore should I
  Gaze skyward? By the roadside lepers crawl,
    And hungry children—hear their quavering call—
While sanctimonious Pharisees pass by,
Too rapt in prayer to heed or make reply.
    Prayer? Yes, and daily heard of men withal.
    And I, whom want and suffering appall—
May I cast stones? The reasoning is wry
    Which answers "Ay," for I know not the springs
Whence flows the poison they have drunk; I know
    My duty is to do my feeble best—
    To clothe—to feed—yea, teach; as for the rest
That onward and tremendous overflow
    I cannot dam—well, *you* are listening.

MAN, AS HE WILL BE

By RICHARD L. GARNER

THE origin of man and his survival after death are two subjects that inspire more theories and speculations than any other topics of the day. The former deals only with the past and depends upon a basis of physical facts known to exist, while the latter claims no concrete basis that is within the scope of human experience. Whatever may be the merits or logic of their claims, both these schools appear to take it for granted that man, as he now exists, has reached the zenith of his organic development and that there are no higher levels for him to attain in this mundane life.

At this juncture and within the reach of the lay mind is another field of speculation which may conduce more to the welfare of man than any other, because it opens up to him a new cosmos and inspires him with new ambitions that he does not have to die in order to realize.

In his present state man is still an animal and but little higher in the scale than other species to which he is allied. In other words, he is still possessed of all the animal functions and amenable to all the exigencies of life and death as other animals are. One lesson that evolution teaches, however, is that progress, onward and upward, is the fundamental law of nature. Every fact we know justifies the assumption that such will continue to be the case as long as organic life exists.

Therefore, the questions arise: To what physical, social and psychic levels will man yet attain as a living entity? To what moral, ethical and intellectual horizons will he ultimately attain? In what direction and to what extent will the animal faculties and functions of man be modified

in the course of his future evolution? To what extent may we forecast his future development from a study of his life history?

It is not a mere guess to predict that the time will come when human beings will be as far advanced above the level they now occupy as they are at present above any former level in the scale of nature from which they have already risen. In other words, the human race will continue to develop along certain lines of refinement, which are merely the lines hitherto followed, but projected into the future. Within the limits of the same scheme its modes of life and thought will be utterly changed. In that stage of his progress, man will cease to eat food, to drink liquids and perform other animal functions, such as he now does, and many of the things in common practice today will be regarded as crude and indelicate.

In order to justify this statement, we will take up a review of man's career heretofore and treat it as we would a stereoptic view. If a scene be depicted upon an area the size of a pin head and then projected upon the screen a foot in diameter, we then have the same picture enlarged many-fold, and we should see many details in the larger one that were invisible in the smaller, although actually present. By repeating this operation and continually increasing the diameter of the screen, we should thus form a series of scenes which would constitute a perspective of the thing depicted. In this manner we find man in the present day standing in the foreground of this perspective, possessing, in a more highly developed and specialized degree, the same faculties that he had in the beginning, and the intersecting planes of this perspective, thrown upon the smaller screens, would serve to show the periods of his progress from protozoan and upward.

Without going into tedious details to describe all the vital processes of the lower forms of animal life from which man must have arisen, we merely skim over them by naming, without describing them. All forms of animal life

seem to have followed the same laws of development and to have arisen from a common source. We find that in the lowest forms, while procreation was accomplished by budding, the manner of taking food was simply by annexing particles of inorganic matter which were chemically transformed into proteins. In the next higher plane of life we find procreation is accomplished by fission and, attending this condition, the animal form had to encyst its food, which was already in the form of proteins, and exude every particle of inorganic matter not already so transformed. On up the scale we go, observing that, from these elemental forms of reproduction, life passes through the stages of a sexual, monosexual and bisexual, with certain intermediate gradations; from the lowest forms we pass through the stages of egg laying, or oviparous system of reproduction, and marsupial (by some called oviparous) and thence to the system of parturition, including the placental mammals. Along with each of these different stages of progress we find other concomitants invariable.

The cardinal function of every form of animal life is alimentation, or the taking of food, and we find as we ascend the scale the amœba and the formaniferæ, which encyst their food, and the fish and the lower types of reptiles that gorge their food without any preparation or mastication. A little higher up the scale we find that the reptilian forms and some of the birds tear their prey apart and swallow it in sections; and, further on, we find some preparing food by crushing and also by mastication. Then, coming to the rodents and lower carnivores, we find that they select their food with a little more care, and prepare it by removing bones, scales, etc. Then we reach the primates and the whole order is a story of metamorphosis, from the lowest to the highest, including man. And just as we ascend that scale we find the selection of food, the manner of preparing it, and the modes of eating it, show one continuous series of progressive steps from the lemurs upward. So far we have spoken only in generalities. Now we shall particularize

a little in order to show the direction of man's progress in this line.

From all the evidence we can find of the earliest of archaic men, those who used the paleolithic implements of tens of thousands of years ago, seemed to have eaten their food with little preparation—still it was evidently better prepared than that of carnivores or other animals, and about this time it appears that man began to cook his food. Certainly, in those primitive days, expert cooks were much more difficult to find than they are in these times. But as man has progressed upwards along other lines, the culinary art has kept pace with him, and even today, while man is yet an animal, the human race is many-fold more fastidious and exacting in its dietary than our ancestors were a few generations ago. Chemists and food experts are forever at work in the laboratories, trying to solve the problem of alimentation with more and more precision, and in the meantime it appears that mankind has developed as many diseases either real or imaginary, as there have been improvements made in feeding him.

In nature we sometimes find concentrated forms of food, for example, in the kola nut, about which there has been a great deal of fiction—nevertheless the truth remains that the kola nut is one of the most concentrated forms of nourishment that we find in the state of nature. But, emulating nature, man has learned to extract, distill, concentrate and reduce the life-giving elements of various kinds of food. Human invention has already gone so far as to roll up a full day's ration for a man in a few small tablets to be carried in his vest pocket. A few thousand years ago, if a man had started on a journey and been required to carry five days' rations with him, as the natives in Africa sometimes do, he would have a load without taking anything else. But the civilized man of modern times can convey his food in more condensed forms, such as desiccated soups, extract of meats and various other condensed articles of food quite familiar to the traveller. Chief among all the prepared foods, per-

haps, is the predigested article, at present intended for weak stomachs, but eventually to be used as standard food.

Now, by projecting this line of development still farther forward, we shall find that man shows a constant tendency to refine the process of alimentation until he reaches a stage in which he will decline to eat as other animals do. Instead of putting food into his mouth by the use of a fork or a spoon, as one stokes a furnace, and then chewing or grinding it up like a pulp mill, man will absorb his nourishment. And this will be done with aesthetic daintiness. In the distant future, instead of the barbarous custom of assembling guests around an altar of immolation, called a table, to witness the carving or disecting of a cadaver, whose form may yet be recognized, the host of that day will assemble his guests about a table adorned with exotic flowers from which will be exhaled invisible fumes of ambrosial proteids, with exquisite odors that will fill the air with vital essence and stimulate the olfactory and palatal nerves, to the verge of intoxication, and by some yet to be discovered means absorb the necessary food. At the same time, all other human sensibilities will be developed along their respective lines in a coordinate degree, and the human figure will become a thing of beauty, the very ideal of which we are not now able to conceive.

Beauty? That has been the ambition of woman from time immemorial, and she has not even tried to conceal it from herself or the world. And the truth of the matter is that the vanity of the male sex has been even more inordinate than that of the female, as we find this desire expressed in the feathers of cock birds and the pelage of other animals, and not by any means obscure in the male human being.

The secret of beauty is to be found in the mind. Every human face and figure is merely the physical conformation of the mind which directs it, and the same is true of lower animals. It always has been my belief that if a few children could be isolated from contact with the masses, and their environments made so perfectly and consistently beau-

tiful that no discord or lack of harmony should ever address itself to the minds of these children, that their health should remain good, that kindness, gentleness and the utmost refinement alone should influence their lives, then such children would improve in beauty as much as they would in moral culture. In one or two or ten generations the end would not be accomplished, nor even in a thousand, but the direction would be plainly indicated. Even in breeding domestic animals, behold what wonders are wrought by the careful arrangement of environment made by breeders. Imagine the thoroughbred horse of today standing beside the wild horse of the Asiatic plains of ten thousand years ago, or even today, without imagination, compare the mountain scrub with his tail full of cockleburrs, to the well-groomed, high stepper seen in Madison Square Garden. In like manner, compare the children of today who are reared in the squalor of East Side New York, or those of the slums of any other city, to the children of refined homes, surrounded by the best influences of the present age, and you will see the influence of environment as expressed in their minds. It is not difficult to forsee that as the human mind becomes more beautiful within itself, it will conceive more beautiful things, and the thoughts of every mind are expressed in the physical conformation of the body.

In like manner, we may proceed to forecast social development in the distant future. The mockery of the marriage ceremony and the divorce courts will be found only in the archives of ancient history. In those coming days, marriages will be by affinity and those affinities will be real instead of the mockeries of the present day parading under such names. Mankind in his present stage is too carnal in his nature to have real affinities. Affiities are too refined, aesthetic and ethereal for the man or woman of the present day to understand. All sexual attractions at present are founded upon passion and marriage is the consequence of that transient, sexual attraction. Polygamy and polyandry are a survival of lower forms of life, found most commonly

in the vegetable kingdom, but still apparent all along the animal scale, decreasing in frequency as we reach the acme of modern civilization. The family at present is the unit of human society, which appears to be the development of the flock and the herd, and as we continue to isolate the groups and sharpen the lines of demarkation between them, we continue to elevate and refine. In the coming days, when real affinities will be the only individuals who will unite, their union will be as irresistible and spontaneous as chemical affinity. And two real affinities will unite as perfectly and inseparably as two drops of water. Neither will ever feel the slightest desire to be united with any other unit of humanity. In other words, the real affinity will be a psychic affinity, whereas the present so-called affinity is merely a physical and temporary attraction one animal has for another. Marriage under such conditions is little, if anything, more than the mating of wild animals. We try to give it a moral aspect by camouflaging it with formalities, ceremonies and superficial displays, but the truth of the matter is that these ceremonies are no more a part of marriage than the label is the part of the contents of a jar.

At the same time that those things we have mentioned shall have become the state of man, he will have developed a new faculty scarcely now suspected. Instead of jetting his breath from the lungs through his vocal organs, and creating a small cyclone or upheaval to shock the tympanum of human ears, he will talk by telepathy and he will talk to his friends in their absence, as well as in their presence. Such a thing is no more impossible than wireless telegraphy, and would probably have been developed by this time if there had been sufficient need of it. When man shall have reached this stage, he will have eliminated many of the diseases that are now prevalent and many of them known to be due to the organs of mastication, digestion and excretion. In dispensing with the crude mechanism of those things, man will have lessened the cause of disease in a like degree, and at the same time the waste and the repair of the body

will go on a thousand fold more smoothly and easily than it does at present. In fact, all the vital processes will be simplified and accelerated. It is possible, also, that collateral with telepathy man may develop other faculities such as teleoptic, teleotic or other senses of which we are not now aware. And collateral with these things, his religion and code of morals will undergo corresponding changes. His mind will widen out to such an extent that it will formulate new ideals of right and wrong. It will be more self reliant and more capable of exercising its individuality. It will no longer need wooden idols, mud images or imaginary deities to protect men from enemies that do not exist, and, in brief, he will probably develop a sixth sense, or conceive definitely of a fourth dimension.

The organs of sensation in all the lower animals are developed to the limits of their utility, while those of man rise to high degree and embrace a sense of beauty, harmony, concord, contrast and other things that conduce to man's pleasure and aestheticism. These facts not only show the tendency of the human mind, but show that it has already risen slightly above the rigid limits of the utilitarian. Reducing the thing to its simplest term let us say that the time is approaching when man will acquire so many new faculties or develop old ones into so many new uses, that he will no longer be a mere animal of a higher plane. He will acquire the faculty of hearing new sounds that range far above and below all the gamuts known to music masters of today. He will see new colors of dazzling brilliancy above and below the spectrum, as we know it now. And man, sitting around the table, adorned with bouquets of flowers, absorbing the life-giving substances of nutritious foods, will see those beautiful colors and hear those rare strains of sublime music while they hold communion with friends all over the world. Such will be the real millennium to which man is looking forward without a definite idea of what it is to be.

AS TO WORLD DISARMAMENT

By JULIUS KAHN

FROM every section of our country come demands for National Disarmament. These demands are generally predicated upon the statements that there is financial stringency throughout the world at the present time; that the tax upon the peoples of the leading nations is a terrific burden for them to bear; that this burden is due largely to the participation of the nations so affected in the recent World War. It is contended that it will be many years probably before these taxes can be materially reduced. It is contended also that these burdens are still further increased by the building up of enormous fleets and the maintenance of large armies by the leading nations of the world. And it is hoped that our country may lead the way for Disarmament by calling a meeting of representatives from all nations to consider and take action regarding this important subject. It is even contended by many citizens of this Republic that the United States ought to lead the way in this movement, even though the other nations may not show an inclination to follow our leadership.

There is no gainsaying the fact that the more advanced thinkers in every important country on this globe are intensely interested in this question of World Disarmament.

The leading nations of the world have just passed through four years of bitter war. Most of the participants in that war find themselves in serious financial straits. Our government loaned the principal Allied Nations an amount which aggregates practically $10,000,000,000. Great Britain and France find themselves at this period unable to meet the payment of interest on the loans they secured from the United States. They have asked for extensions of

time in order to be able to meet those interest charges. If private corporations found themselves financially embarrassed in this way, their creditors would probably begin proceedings in the courts of their country to declare them bankrupt. Undoubtedly many years will pass before the warring nations will again find themselves on a firm financial footing.

But what of the millions of young men who have been killed in the struggle? What of the other millions who find themselves hopelessly wounded and a burden on their fellow men? What amount of money can compensate any nation for these latter losses?

The government of the United States, it is contended, is the wealthiest government in the world today. And yet our citizens are groaning under the burden of debt that the War has forced upon the shoulders of our people. Small wonder, therefore, that one hears the constant demand for Disarmament in our own country, as well as elsewhere at the present time.

It is frequently asserted that 90 per cent. of the entire taxation for this country is applied to the payment of the debt growing out of our participation in past wars and preparation for our possible entrance into future wars. And it is correspondingly asserted that this large expenditure for the military establishment leaves only about 10 per cent. of our income to be applied to other activities of our government. It is also contended that of the 90 per cent. that goes to our military and naval establishments about 70 per cent. of the total is used for the payment of interest on our war debts, the payment of pensions, the maintenance of soldiers' homes, soldiers' hospitals, national cemeteries and other institutions of a military or quasi military character. To be sure, every patriotic American fully realizes that this is a terrible cost to pay for our participation in past military operations.

It seems, therefore, that in view of the world situation in regard to these questions, the United States may well take the lead in calling for a world conference where the subject

of Disarmament might be frankly, freely and fully discussed. Whether the other nations will accept our invitation is purely a matter of conjecture, but many Americans believe that Congress can well afford to pass a resolution authorizing the President to call such a conference at the earliest practicable date.

At the Peace Table in Paris, in 1919, our Commissioners frankly stated that we asked no indemnities of any kind for our participation in the World War. We wanted neither money nor territory from the defeated belligerents. We showed the world that we entered the struggle in order to maintain the rights of our government and our people against those enemies who attempted to thwart and throttle those rights.

It seems proper, under the circumstances, that the world conference on Disarmament be called in the city of Washington at the earliest practicable date.

There are thousands of patriotic Americans who maintain that it is our duty to lead the way in the movement for Disarmament, even though the other nations might not deem it advisable to follow our leadership. These Americans feel that by taking this course we will inspire the peoples of the other countries to follow our altruistic example. To those countrymen of ours who feel that such a course would have any influence whatever on the peoples of other governments, it is only fair to say that our country has taken this lead already by cutting down materially its land forces. Congress within the last few weeks has passed a resolution instructing the War Department to reduce our Regular Army to an enlisted personnel of 175,000 men. Assuming that our population for the Continental United States is 105,709,000 inhabitants, the military forces provided by Congress is approximately 16 per cent. of our population. The only two nations in the world that have a smaller percentage of soldiers in their respective armies are Paraguay, which has 15 per cent., and the United States of Colombia, which has 11 per cent. On January 20, 1921, we had 222,-

900 enlisted men in our Regular Army. The approximate strength of that Army compared to our population is 21 per cent. As soon as the Army is reduced to 175,000, the percentage will shrink to a little over 16 per cent.

The Republic of Switzerland, which has compulsory universal military service, has a population of 4,000,000 persons. Its regular army consists of 170,000 soldiers, which is 4.25 per cent. of the total population of that country. This army of the little Swiss Republic, in proportion to its total population, is the largest regular army in the world.

The following figures as to the population, the size of the regular army and the percentage of the population embraced in that army in European countries, as well as in our own, form a most interesting exhibit.

COUNTRY	Population	Regular Army	Regular Army in per cent of Population
Switzerland	4,000,000	170,000	4.25
Greece	7,500,000	240,000	3.20
Esthonia	1,200,000	36,500	3.04
Poland	30,072,000	815,000	2.71
Lithuania	2,000,000	40,000	2.00
Roumania	17,393,200	323,600	1.86
France	39,601,500[a]	735,300	1.85
Latvia	2,605,000	45,000	1.73
Czecho-Slovakia	13,215,500	216,800	1.64
Albania	850,000	13,500	1.58
Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.	14,365,500	194,000	1.35
Belgium	7,555,600[b]	100,000	1.32
Italy	36,740,000	464,000	1.26
Norway	2,391,800[c]	30,000	1.25
Finland	3,325,000	35,000	1.05
Spain	20,695,700[b]	216,600	1.05
Denmark	2,941,000	27,500	.94
Great Britain	45,516,000[a]	425,000[f]	.93
Turkey	12,000,000	100,000[g]	.83
Russia (Bolshevist)	182,182,000[d]	1,500,000[h]	.82
Bulgaria	4,430,000	32,000	.72
Portugal	5,545,600	33,000	.60
Hungary	7,690,000	36,000	.46
Austria	6,400,000	22,000	.33
Netherlands	6,724,700[e]	20,000	.30
Sweden	5,813.800[b]	15,600	.27
Germany	55,086,000[h]	150,000	.27
United States	105,709,000[k]	222,900[i]	.21

a. 1911.
b. 1918.
c. 1910.
d. 1915.

e. 1917.
f. Includes 130,000 Indian Troops serving outside of India.
g. Nationalist Army.
h. Estimated.
i. Estimated enlisted strength, not including Philippine Scouts, January 20, 1921.
k. Continental.

The above figures, which are taken from our own War Department, disclose the fact that we have reduced our military force below the force of any European nation. The figures also disclose the fact that the people of the United States have practically disarmed themselves. But I do not read in the daily press or other publications any serious attempt on the part of the other great nations in Europe to reduce their enlisted personnel to the low figures we have prescribed for the size of the Regular Army of the United States.

Those of our countrymen who believe that by materially reducing our forces we would set an example to the countries of Europe cannot acquire any amount of comfort out of these figures.

Neither do the figures as to the populations and approximate strength of the regular armies of American and Asiatic countries show an inclination to follow our lead in the matter of military Disarmament.

The following figures as to the populations and approximate strengths of the regular armies of American and Asiatic countries, as compared to the United States in 1920, also afford a very instructive exhibit.

COUNTRY	Population	Regular Army.	Regular Army in per cent of Population
Uruguay	1,400,000	9,800	.70
Mexico	16,000,000	90,000	.56
Chile	4,000,000	20,000	.50
Japan	58,000,000	273,200	.47
Ecuador	1,300,000	6,000	.46
China	400,000,000	1,369,900	.34
Venezuela	2,848,000	9,000	.31
Argentina	8,300,000	23,000	.27
Bolivia	3,000,000	7,100	.23
Peru	3,530,000	7,500	.21
Brazil	22,000,000	37,000	.16
Paraguay	1,000,000	1,500	.15
Colombia	5,475,000	6,000	.11
United States	105,709,000*	222,900**	.21

* Continental.
** Estimated enlisted strength, not including Philippine Scouts, to January 20, 1921.

From a study of these figures, it will be seen readily that as compared to the armies of France, Great Britain, Bolshevist Russia, Germany, Japan, Mexico and even China, the Regular Army of the United States is an exceedingly small one.

Recent newspaper articles indicate that Japan proposes to complete eight battleship dreadnoughts and eight large armored cruisers. Our own country contemplates the construction of a number of similar vessels in order to carry out a program which was agreed upon several years ago. These authorized and projected building programs extend through a series of years, terminating, so far as the Japanese projects are concerned, in 1927. The cost of these immense fighting machines has grown enormously and there is no telling what the end will be unless some program of Disarmament shall be agreed to.

To make such a program effective, all the leading nations must agree to the suspension of construction. If a single leading nation shall refuse to agree to the program fixed by the delegates to the disarmament conference, it would probably be impossible for our country to refrain from carrying out such a program as our naval authorities may recommend. That is self-evident. A nation is but an aggregation of individuals. Self-protection is the first law of nations as it is of individuals.

While it seems evident to those who look back upon the horrors of the World War that the peoples of all countries would be materially benefited by adopting a holiday so far as the construction of additional fighting ships, including submarines and airships, any Disarmament agreement to be effective, must be adopted by all the leading nations if it is to have any beneficial result so far as the security of the world against future war is concerned.

IS THERE A MORAL DECLINE?

By GERTRUDE ATHERTON

"IS there a moral decline?" How very odd that any one in the United States of America should ask such a question! No country since the world began has had so many moral guardians, self-imposed and legal. I merely touch upon the painful subject of prohibition and drop it. It is, and that is the end of it. (When it isn't—but that is by the way.) Think of the moving-picture censors, who will carefully eliminate from a picture the details of a convict's escape from prison, lest the youth in the audience turn criminal for the fun of breaking out. Think of the towns that are passing laws forbidding high heels, short skirts and transparent blouses. Think of the impending blue laws and the crusade against tobacco. Some years ago, by the way, twelve good women and true of Los Angeles, pillars of the W. C. T. U., called on me and extracted a promise (I was forced to give it or we should all be sitting there yet) that I would not smoke in public any more. Several times there had been front-page "stories" of this sensational breach of morality on my part, and the ignorant youth of the country (according to these good ladies) argued that if I smoked and retained my health and power to turn out a book a year or so, smoking was rather a virtue than a vice. I really gave my promise because I felt sorry for the women—they were so much in earnest, and it was not difficult to guess the large futility of their endeavors.

There is an old generally ignored statute that any man or woman transgressing the moral code is liable to arrest and imprisonment. There is but one place I know of where this law is sometimes put into effect—Los Angeles, California. Some one has wittily said that the reason there is a scandal a

day in the Southern California newspapers is because the methodist spirit is constantly at war with the climate. I should say the odds were in favor of the climate (after observations covering some seven months in Hollywood, the center of the moving picture industry), but occasionally the stern, uncompromising spirit of methodism triumphs and a delinquent is arrested. Whether it be true, as rumored, that certain men and women have found the law handy for revenge, I am not in a position to say.

Let us consider our famous censor of morals in New York. No one can deny the tenderness of his care in suppressing such a book as Jurgen. Think of the millions that might have been corrupted by reading that book. It is quite as immoral as the Electra of Sophocles, or The Turn of the Screw, by our own Henry James; but some things are bound to escape even the vigilant eye of our censor and when he does happen upon a chance to prove his solicitude for public morality than he uses his public office for all it is worth. That Jurgen is a masterpiece, one of the few in American literature, makes it all the more dangerous. So does the fact that the innocent mind would have to take a microscope to find the naughtiness (plain only to the highly sophisticated, who are beyond any censor's hope). Subtlety rightfully incurs the suspicion of any pillar of democracy. All cards should be on the table. Subtlety gives to think, and much thinking will find hidden wickedness even where none is intended. Save our youth (who are notoriously addicted to subtly written masterpieces) at all cost. So Jurgen now costs fifty dollars a copy, and its author, Mr. Cabell, has taken to writing for the Yale Review; which, by the way, brazenly advertises their contributor as the author of Jurgen. Will not the censor please suppress the Yale Review?

Now let us take what is admittedly the best novel (or chronicle) of 1920—Main Street. (The Domesday Book, of course, is in a class by itself.) It must have sold a hundred thousand copies by this time and I hope it will sell

a million more. It portrays a small town typical of tens of thousands of small towns in the United States; and what is the impression that remains in one's memory after one has read a dozen or two other novels in bed at night? Is it a mad orgie of dancing, immorality, crime, a repetition of ancient Rome and still more ancient Atlantis? Oh, no! Not by a long sight. It is the history of a people who are sordid, mean, and petty, vulgar, common, unambitious, backbiting, ill-educated, suspicious of any attempt even of amateur attempts to improve what passes for their minds; smug, conceited, and vicious as a lioness bereft of her cubs over any suspected moral lapse. Of course the book is one-sided. There are estimable, mentally ambitious, openly or secretly immoral, travelled and broad-minded people in every small town; human nature in its infinite variety, cropping out everywhere from mountain hamlets to desert islands temporarily inhabited by castaways. But in the main it is true; Mr. Lewis has concerned himself with the majority and the majority rules, when it comes to atmosphere. There is no evidence in this chronicle of Main Streets of America that the dancing craze, popularly supposed to inaugurate the downfall of nations, has taken possession of our middle-class, and is not the middle-class the backbone of any nation? Nor is any tendency to indulge in terspichorean revels observable in the ranks of the famous proletariat, even since wood alcohol has taken the place of straight whiskey or the sinister juice of the hop. All communities, even the smallest, have their gay little "bunches," but the bunch is lost in the herd, and the herd chews its cud from birth till death and regards life with the large bovine gaze of formidable respectability.

Take even this new heterogeneous city of Los Angeles, of which Hollywood, my present place of abode, is a distant (and exotic) annex. The newspapers could not be more sensational if printed in blood, and the casual visitor might be pardoned for believing that it spent its days in one wild orgie of murder and marital delinquencies. But it is a city

of over half a million inhabitants and under this red froth no Main Street ever pursued the tenor of its way more evenly, had a larger proportion of good, quiet, domestic, ultra-respectable people. Like all large cities it has its show-dens of vice, its "gay bunches," its local and floating criminal element, but, ah!—the majority. You only find its parallel in the great French bourgeoisie. They'll reform even the newspapers yet.

Of Hollywood I shall write after I have left it, but Hollywood is itself and no other.

That is a curious superstition—that when a nation begins to dance its downfall is at hand. It is true that Rome danced (possibly Atlantis, although authorities are not as exact as they might be), but then Rome also spent long hours in hot scented baths (do our million Main Streets?); they over-ate and lived for pleasure generally—the small upper class reclining on the bent backs of their swarming slaves—merely because, having reached the pinnacle of civilization, as civilization went in those days, having achieved all that was left in their ken to achieve, they had nothing to do but amuse themselves; and naturally grew so soft and devitalized that they would have been gobbled up in one mouthful by any hardy savage tribe that swept down upon them. Are we in similar case? To use the expressive vernacular of our boys, "Not so's you'd notice it." Even our large cities are only big small towns, as plodding and respectable as the Main Streets in all but those centers of high activity, where people dance for want of other exercise and amusement, and to which flows naturally the frivolous, idle, possibly immoral element with too much money and leisure; an element that has existed in every great city since the beginning of time, and no doubt will continue to exist until its end.

Paris was dancing madly before the war; she had "the craze." Everybody was talking about it. Even the good bourgeoisie, those that dwelt in Paris, at least, were affected. We all know how she collapsed from internal rottenness on August 1st, 1914. There was a time when Spain owned

nearly three-fourths of the earth's surface. Was it dancing or brutal stupidity that caused her gradual downfall? Did dancing sink the Armada? Was dancing responsible for the collapse of the old Russian régime, or the same brutal stupidity that distinguished Spain in a century when there was more excuse? The peasants in Germany danced on Sundays, their only day of leisure, and so they had done for centuries; but, with the exception of the coarse imitations of Paris vice in Berlin, there was no outbreak of dancing in Germany before the war. They are a heavy-footed race and prefer to eat and grow fat. But they turned the world into chaos.

It is a silly old superstition, and only trotted out when some writer is hard up for publicity and the press for news. If the Main Streets would take to dancing and tune their sluggish blood and brains to action, we should have no "Red menace," no necessity for such disquieting warnings as "Seed of the Sun."

Honor? Is it decaying? Taking a backward glance through history I should say that the diplomatists of today lie and intrigue pretty much as they have done since the dawn of history—no better, no worse. (Judging from Mr. Wilson's experience at the Paris Conference, it looks as if we were too honorable and honest to survive.) Big Business, Little Business, Yankee horse-traders, belong to the same class; in other words, show the same old crooked streaks inherent in human nature. Lenin cynically announces that he will keep his word only when it suits him; but all fanatics have a screw loose—in other words, are unnormal. The vast majority of people grow up under a certain discipline—first of the home and the school, and then of life, are taught that it is wiser to keep your word than to break it. Crooks, even in high places, "get theirs" sooner or later, even if only in being ostracized to a pale where they have no friends and fewer opportunities.

Take it all in all, it seems to me that if the United States of America is conquered by internal or external enemies it will not be from bad morals but smug stupidity.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY

By Hon. Daniel F. Cohalan, L.C.D.

Part II

THE Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars created a new political policy relative to maritime war. France, Russia, Holland, Spain, Prussia, Denmark and Sweden joined America in declaring that free ships made free goods.

General resentment was aroused against England for her arbitrary exercise of her power of control of the seas. The 19th Century has seen many attempts on our part to get assent to the traditional American policy that free ships make free goods; with limitation of search and seizure and actual maintenance of blockade; but every diplomatic negotiation touching on these questions has resulted in omissions from the final drafts which were more significant than all the written concessions. The late Treaty at Versailles with its failure to discuss the freedom of the seas has many illustrious precedents in Anglo-American diplomatic procedure.

All our attempts to open up trade on a large scale with the West Indies were defeated. Valueless concessions were granted by England. With our extraordinary internal growth and development the need of these markets for a time decreased, as outlets were found for American enterprise and capital in the new lands within our own borders. Before this condition was reached we tried for years to obtain a favorable treaty of commerce with Great Britain. The Jay treaty was a mockery in this respect, for while real concessions were granted by us to England, she granted to us only the form of concessions, keeping for herself the

substance. England had in those times always imported to the United States goods greatly in excess in value of our exports. The balance was sometimes met by our trade with the West Indies. It was a serious blow to our commercial interests when England steadily refused to open the West Indies to us while encouraging Canada to take advantage of such trade. There was nothing inconsistent in this action, as for generations it had been her settled policy to control the seas, and to reach out for economic control of the world. One of the prominent clauses of the treaty read as follows:

> The River Mississippi shall, however, according to the treaty of peace, be entirely open to both parties; and it is further agreed, that all the ports and places on its Eastern side, to whichsoever of the parties belonging, may freely be resorted to and be used by both parties, in as ample a manner as any of the Atlantic ports or places of the United States, or any of the ports or places of his Majesty in Great Britain.

To appreciate fully the significance of this clause we must remember that Spain held the west bank of the Mississippi and claimed all the western territory; that it controlled the mouth of the river; and that we could use this outlet only by a very grudging and limited agreement with Spain, which was withdrawn entirely in the year 1802. The secret cession of Louisiana to Napoleon by Spain and its subsequent sale to us when he was disappointed in securing Santa Domingo in the West Indies as a naval base from which to organize a new colonial Empire in Louisiana were decisive facts in determining the stability and growth of the young Republic.

In 1819 Spain ceded to the United States all the territory East of the Mississippi claimed by her, including Florida, but the final ratification was not exchanged until 1821. Spanish-American revolutions had been going on since 1808 when the Crown of Spain had been given to Joseph Bonaparte. By 1821 practically all that remained of the Spanish Empire in the two Americas were the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico.

The Revolutionary War had its lessons in diplomacy for the Americans. Spain entered the war to help France, but with a secret understanding that the price of her assistance should be the recapture of Gibraltar from the English, and she pledged France not to conclude peace until this end was attained. When hostilities were concluded England refused to give up Gibraltar, but pacified Spain by receding Florida to her. The English treaty with the United States included a secret clause, relative to the northern boundary of Florida, which caused much serious friction between the United States and Spain. The map shows us a very significant fact. We were entirely shut off from the Gulf of Mexico by Spanish territory. Our southernmost port was Savannah. This made the Southwest dependent upon the Mississippi for an outlet for their goods. It was more than half a century before we secured our present southern boundary. Every concession thereto was obtained, either from Spain, or from a Spanish colony, with the single exception of the Louisiana Purchase. At every stage of progress in this connection we were met with the more or less open hostility of Great Britain.

There is a wealth of meaning in the comment of Lord Bryce in his American Commonwealth:

> What need not have happened and might, even have been thought unlikely, was the easy acquisition by the Anglo-Americans of California, Oregon and Washington; regions far removed from the dominions which the Republic already possessed. Had the competition for unappropriated temperate regions been half as keen in 1840, as it is now for tropical Africa (a far less attractive posession), between Germany, France and Britain some European power might have pounced upon these territories. . . . It is not nature, but the historical accident which left them in the hands of a feeble power like Mexico, that has made them now, and so far as can be forseen, for a long future, members of the great federation.

He might well have added to "the historical accident" the Monroe doctrine.

The next great step in the permanent foreign policy was the declaration of the Monroe Doctrine in the President's Congressional message of December 2, 1823. This much

talked of doctrine, although ascribed to various temporary reasons, was, in reality, the natural development of the growth of the United States and the complement of that policy so clearly enunciated by Washington and several other fathers of the Republic warning us against entangling alliances with the countries of Europe. It was no accidental declaration. It came in the order of nature, and at a time when the young Republic had reached a point in its growth towards the moral leadership of the world which justified and required our placing ourselves, in a protective sense, at the head of all the countries of the new world, so as to permanently ward off from our shores all the attempted encroachments which the ambitions, the intrigues, or the selfish interests of the old world might attempt to make.

The enunciation of our foreign policy may be said to have begun, so far as foreign nations were concerned, by Washington's declaration on the subject of the dangers to us in entangling alliances.

He solidly laid down the foundations of what might be called our permanent political isolation from the quarrels and jealousies of the old world.

Monroe in his enlightened and inspired message gave notice to all that the Western Hemisphere was finally to be dedicated to liberty; that no further encroachments would be permitted; and that, with the passing of time, bit by bit of all that remained of monarchical or imperial power, upon the Western Hemisphere, would have to give way to liberty and to the rule of the people.

Many efforts have been made to give to Canning, the English Minister, the credit for suggesting this doctrine to our Minister to Great Britain. The assertion of Canning, that "he called the new world into existence to redress the balance of the old" has been repeated times without number, but the preceding sentence, which has the mark of accuracy, has been practically ignored. "I resolved," he declared in Parliament, "that if France had Spain, it should not be Spain with the Indies" (meaning the West Indies).

The significance of this remark rests upon the general European situation after the defeat of Napoleon and the Congress of Vienna. The "BIG FOUR" of that day were Russia, Austria, Prussia and Great Britain. They made the quadruple alliance; arranged for frequent Congresses to consider the measure necessary "for the maintenance of the peace of Europe"; and pledged themselves to intervene whenever revolution or usurpation threatened.

In 1815 the Spanish ruler, Ferdinand the Seventh, was restored to the throne, and in 1818, France was admitted to the alliance. The year 1820 saw the first organized revolution against the royal absolutism which had been forced on Europe by the Congress of Vienna. It was particularly serious in Spain, and in 1822 a conference was held at Verona, and the policy of French intervention in Spain adopted. When France intervened in 1823, the question of Cuba again commanded public attention. It was reported that England had offered to supply the constitutional government of Spain with funds in her struggle with France and to occupy Cuba as a pledge for repayment. For these facts, in an excellent statement of the entire episode, reference is made to Professor Latane's admirable work on Latin-America. While the British Government disclaimed any design on Cuba, the American Government was not satisfied that there was no foundation for the reports. Jefferson, however, when he was consulted by President Monroe, advised in a remarkable letter, dated at Monticello, June 11, 1823:

> I have ever deemed it fundamental for the United States, never to take active part in the quarrels of Europe. Their political interests are entirely distinct from ours. Their mutual jealousies, their balance of power, their complicated alliances, their forms and principles of government, are all foreign to us. They are nations of eternal war. All their energies are expanded in the destruction of the labor, property and lives of their people. On our part never have a people so favorable a chance of trying the opposite system, of peace and fraternity with mankind, and the direction of all our means and faculties, to the purpose of improvement instead of destruction. With Europe we have few occasions of collision, and these, with a little prudence and for-

> bearance, may be generally accommodated. Of the brethren of our own Hemisphere, none are yet, or for an age to come will be, in a shape, condition or disposition to war against us, and the foothold which the nations of Europe had in either America, is slipping from under them, so that we shall soon be rid of their neighborhood. Cuba alone seems at present to hold up a speck of war to us. Its possession by Great Britain would indeed be a great calamity to us. Could we induce her to join us in guaranteeing its independence against all the world *except* Spain, it would be nearly as valuable to us as if it were our own. But should she take it, I would not immediately go to war for it; because the first war on other accounts will give it to us; or the island will give itself to us when able so to do." And again in the same letter "That England is playing false with Spain cannot be doubted. Her Government is looking one way and rowing another. . . . The diplomatic correspondence, she (England) is now displaying, these double papers, fabricated merely for exhibition, in which she makes herself talk of morals and principle as if her qualms of conscience would not permit her to go all lengths with the Holy Alliance, are all to gull her own people.

This exchange of correspondence occurred in June, 1823, and furnishes an interesting commentary upon the Monroe Doctrine which was declared in the same year.

No problem as to the South American States then existed for the United States, for we, in 1822, had already recognized their independence. The Canning-Rush conferences, of which so much is made nowadays by the new history makers, began in August, 1823, and concerned not a suggestion for the Monroe Doctrine, but a proposal for what was, in effect, an Anglo-American alliance—a scheme which always has been of absorbing interest to English Ministers from the time of our successful Revolution against England down to our own day.

Before the end of 1823 Ferdinand was restored to the throne, and the prospect of intervention in South America, to quell the revolutions, which had been in progress, more or less intermittently, since the usurpation of the Spanish Crown by the brother of Napoleon, became imminent. England agreed to this intervention on certain conditions, chief of which was that France should not possess herself of any Spanish colonies. England had no intention of seeing the old Spanish commercial monopoly reimposed upon the

American colonists of Spain, nor of relinquishing the control of the Atlantic which had been won by Nelson at Trafalgar in 1805 by his defeat of the combined navies of France and Spain. She feared that the French might demand and obtain Cuba as the price of assistance given to Spain. Cuba was a strategic point of the greatest importance, as it commanded the commerce of the West Indies and the Central American States and largely controlled, as well, the traffic with the old world of the Mississippi Valley.

Its importance had been long recognized by American statesmen. President Madison said in 1810:

> The position of Cuba gives the United States so deep an interest in the destiny even of that Island that, although they may be an inactive, they could not be a satisfied spectator at its falling under any European government which might make a fulcrum of that position against the commerce and security of the United States.

All during this time there had been persistent and continued rumors in the United States that England proposed to acquire Cuba. In 1817 it was reported that she had proposed to relinquish her claim against Spain, for the maintenance of the British Army during the Peninsular war, in consideration for the cession of Cuba.

When the United States obtained Florida by the treaty of 1819, the British press insisted that England occupy Cuba to offset the influence of the United States. The Monroe Doctrine, instead of agreeing with this demand, was a declaration against European intervention and colonization in America which excluded England, in common with all other European nations, from further participation in American affairs. It is not possible within the limits of this article to go into the complexities of the various applications of the Monroe Doctrine. There seems, however, an increasing tendency, in certain quarters, to adopt the viewpoint that President Monroe spoke only for his own administration and for his own time; and to hold that the Monroe Doctrine is not a fixed rule for the future; that it does not create an obligation towards our Latin-American

neighbors, nor assure to them a pledge of protection, and—not the least important—that it is not a part of international law, and in its origin and application has remained a purely executive policy.

Never were there a series of more shortsighted assertions. Representative statesmen in this country, in succeeding generations, have recognized that the Monroe Doctrine is a permanent policy of American diplomacy; that, with its complement, Washington's policy against entangling alliances, it forms the twin pillars upon which stands the great superstructure of American security and strength. No better statement has been made concerning it than that of President Cleveland in 1895:

> The doctrine upon which we stand is strong and sound because its enforcement is important to our safety and peace as a nation, and is essential to the integrity of our free institutions and the tranquil maintenance of our distinctive form of government. It was intended to apply to every stage of our national life, and cannot become obsolete while our republic endures.

It distinctly did create something new; a prohibition, "that the American continents . . . are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." At every crisis in our foreign relations this prohibition has been progressive and uninterrupted. In 1825 Secretary Clay notified France that we would not consent to the occupation of Cuba or Porto Rico "by any other power than Spain under any contingency whatever." This prevented a transfer of sovereignty between European powers. In 1845-1848 President Polk stated that the acquisition of territory by a European power by cession would be considered as dangerous to the safety of the United States.

In 1914 Mr. Root said that the doctrine "is not international law, but it rests upon the right of self-protection and that right is recognized by international law."

American participation in the first Peace Conference at the Hague added a strikingly progressive statement of the Monroe Doctrine when our representatives made the fol-

lowing reservation to the treaty for the pacific settlement of international disputes:

> Nothing contained in this Convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions or policy or internal administration of any foreign State; nor shall anything contained in the said Convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude towards purely American questions.

Under more recent administrations—those of Presidents Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson—the position has been taken that we must expand the Monroe Doctrine—so as to anticipate European intervention instead of waiting for the immediate menace of such intervention—by applying it to issues arising from restrained creation of public debts and irresponsible financial administration. As Professor Lataue states, "recent treaties in the Carribean States have converted American policy into law."

President Cleveland's prohibition included any extension of boundaries by European powers. This controversy in 1895 is notable for one other important consideration. Mr. Olney gave to us the following interpretation:

> No European power or combination of European powers shall forcibly deprive an American State of the right and power of self-government, and of shaping for itself, its own political fortunes and destinies.

Lord Salisbury, Premier of England (father of Lord Robert Cecil and uncle of Mr. Arthur James Balfour), claimed that no political system was being imposed on any State of South America and denied that the Monroe Doctrine was a part of international law since it had not received the consent of other nations. He repudiated the contention that "American questions are for American discussion."

President Cleveland replied relative to the status of the doctrine:

> It may not have been admitted in so many words to the code of international law, but since in international councils every nation is entitled to the rights belonging to it, if the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine is something we may justly claim, it has its place in the code of international law as certainly and as

> securely as if it were specifically mentioned. . . . The Monroe Doctrine finds its recognition in those principles of international law which are based upon the theory that every nation shall have its rights protected and its just claims enforced.

In the light of this correspondence the sophistry of the clause in the Treaty of Peace, Article 21 is evident, "nothing in this covenant *shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace.*"

First, by implication here, the Monroe Doctrine—which is labeled "a regional understanding," by the use of the word "or"—which signifies an alternative—is specifically placed outside the field of international engagements.

Does not the clause further imply that such validity as it possesses arises from its function "for securing the maintenance of peace"? This is in distinct contradiction of the construction and interpretation of President Cleveland who stated: "It is important to our peace and safety as a nation and thus within the scope of international law."

An interesting, and to some extent overlooked, extension of the Monroe Doctrine was contained in President Roosevelt's message of December 3, 1901:

> This doctrine has nothing to do with the commercial relations with any American power, save that in truth it allows each of them to form such as it desires. In other words, it is really a guarantee of the commercial independence of the Americas. We do not ask under this doctrine for any exclusive commercial dealings with any other American State. We do not guarantee any State against punishment, if it misconducts itself; provided that punishment does not take the form of the acquisition of territory by any non-American power.

An examination of the series of articles on political affairs written during the past six or seven years, reveals a remarkable unanimity, among certain writers, in declaring

the Monroe Doctrine has maintained itself by reason of England's supporting sea power. The persistence of this claim and its suggestion from so many quarters are a tribute to the strength and skill of English propaganda. The Doctrine has never been squarely challenged by any European power except England, and it was the readiness of Cleveland with all the strength of our country behind him to resist Salisbury's claim, that finally made the Doctrine unquestioned and irresistible.

We may well wonder as to what treatment the Monroe Doctrine would have received under the League of Nations which "will make provisions to secure and maintain freedom of communications," should an administration base its interference to the British scheme of a cable terminus on the Florida coast, on the ground that it would injure the commercial independence of the Americas.

Is it not unfortunate also that the situation in Hayti has been stated to be such that an appeal for protection to a sympathetic British commander was in order? Hayti, it will be remembered, with its sister Dominican Republic, was the center from which Napoleon planned to build his Colonial Empire, with New Orleans as its port of entry. The recent marvelous development of New Orleans, its strategic position in relation to the country itself; to the West Indies and to the Panama Canal give it a new importance in Carribean politics. To be sure, plans are under way to enlarge the harbor of Jamaica, but it must be regarded as an "historical accident" that both Cuba and Hayti have been removed from being incorporated in the great system of British trade routes.

As Mr. Root well said:

> It is plain that the building of the Panama Canal greatly accentuated the practical necessity of the Monroe Doctrine, as it applies to all the territory surrounding the Carribean or near the Bay of Panama. . . . The plainest lessons of history and

> the universal judgment of all responsible students of the subject concur in teaching that the potential command of the route to and from the Canal must rest with the United States, and that the vital interests of the nation forbid that such command shall pass into other hands. Certainly no nation which has acquiesced in the British occupation of Egypt will dispute this proposition.

The advisability of a waterway across the Isthmus has been considered since as early as the days of Spanish occupation, and England was never blind to the possibilities of this project. Before the treaty of Versailles in 1783, which recognized our independence, English settlers had located on the shores of what is now British Honduras, and the treaty specified certain commercial privileges which were to be reserved to them. In 1835 the colonists petitioned to have their settlement recognized as a British colony and for its jurisdiction over the so-called Mosquito Coast. Great Britain formally recognized British Honduras, and by 1848 the Nicaraguans were driven out from the Mosquito territory which formed practically the entire eastern coast line of their country, and were forced by treaty to concede to England control of the Port of San Juan River. This secured to England the eastern terminus of what was considered for a long time the most favorable route for the canal. Two years earlier, in 1846, the United States had signed a treaty with New Granada, now Colombia, which was not ratified until 1848. The same year England took forcible possession of the Port of San Juan.

The Colombian treaty guaranteed to the Government of the United States the right of way, or transit across the Isthmus of Panama, on the same terms as those of the citizens of Colombia.

Since then, and after much negotiation and preparation the State of Panama came into existence—breaking away from Colombia—and after a cession to us with all rights of sovereignty of a definite strip of land extending from ocean to ocean—the Panama Canal has been successfully and efficiently constructed. It was scarcely finished when England, ever alert to seize the main chance, made a claim that pre-

vented our shipping from having the advantages which Americans should have in an American waterway and a supine administration forced through the Senate a measure which was at once a humiliation to us and a triumph for England. It is a fitting time now to re-assert all American rights, and nowhere is there one which more nearly affects our self-respect and our interests. It is time to correct one of the great outstanding blunders of the Wilson administration and to insist that the Panama Canal, planned, built and paid for by America, shall be exclusively American, and that England shall not, as at present, be permitted to share the control of this wonderful achievement of American genius and impose upon our shipping either directly or indirectly any burden in favor of the shipping of another land. We must insist that our coastwise shipping shall be allowed to pass through our own canal, without payment of tolls, or the bearing of burdens of any kind or nature.

Let us further bridge over our differences with Colombia and by action, honorable to both of us, mollify a proud people and show them and all of our Southern neighbors that while our strength may be invincible, it is not great enough to permit us to do, even unwittingly, what our friends might regard as a wrong to a weaker nation.

Washington, with the foresight of a seer and the vision of a prophet, clearly saw that the independence of the United States, recognized by the Treaty of Versailles, would be of small avail unless the infant state were guarded from external as well as internal dangers. He fully realized that, while England had received a great defeat in the severance of the ties that bound the thirteen colonies to her, she yet remained a tremendous force in the immediate vicinity of the infant republic, and was determined either to regain her political power over America, or to prevent the growth here of a great commercial and trade rival.

The immense territory of Canada and of the English maritime provinces of the East, rolled to the north of us. She held in the islands of the West Indies great strategic

points of vantage, of such values in her eyes, that she had, with reluctance, given up Guadaloupe to France in exchange for Canada. She had various points of contact upon the continent, more than sufficient, to enable her, through them, to make claim, later on, for large tracts of territory, and her continental rivals, France and Spain, were still looking to other territories in the new world as permanent sources of strength and of wealth.

A great school of thought in England, that has had followers there and here ever since, held that the separation of the former colonies from England was only temporary, and that the day was certain to come which would see them reunited. Accordingly, Washington felt that the Republic would have to act at once courageously and warily. It would have to look out for its own interests, to the exclusion of all others, and could not permit itself to be bound, to its loss, by any ties of sympathy or amity with any other country. Throughout all the balance of his public career he insisted upon acting upon those lines, and his last words to his countrymen were those by which they have ever since profited. We have followed his advice against making entangling alliances with any other country, or having anything more than temporary participation in European affairs. We well learned from him, as we have since, from the stern realities of time, that Europe has a series of primary interests with which we are not concerned.

The Monroe Doctrine has taken us a step forward, in insisting that we have a set of primary interests, in which we will not tolerate European interference or dictation. One by one the monarchical flags have disappeared from the Western Hemisphere. To-day, with the exception of the flag of Holland covering a small territory, the only remaining one is that of England, and the final extension of the Monroe Doctrine will push England from this Hemisphere just as the other monarchies have disappeared from view. If our whole strength is thrown behind a doctrine which forbids interference from the old world with the Western

Hemisphere, can we consistently, in law or morals, permit any country of the old world to call upon colonies here for assistance in a European conflict, without taking into account the certainty, that such aid will be resented in days to come by the countries against which it may be given.

Canada was drawn through England's genius into the great war to do her share in serving the English Empire. She rendered services and contributed resources that were undoubtedly of immense value to England in her days of danger and despair. Her valiant sons were sent to death on many fields and an immense debt of nearly two billions of dollars was heaped upon her to save England and to enable her to strengthen her hold upon her wide domain. While England may prove forgetful of these favors, the Continental peoples against whom Canada fought will remember with bitterness the Canadian intrusion into a European quarrel and will wait an opportunity to repay the debt of vengeance.

Only our insistent maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine will turn away this wrath from our Hemisphere, and we should now shape events so that there will be no longer in the New World any European interests or territories to be the pawn or prize of European quarrels or conflicts.

While Europe is broken in strength and spirit, and while England is seeking from us favors, upon the granting of which her whole future depends, we should lay down conditions that, while they may be generous to her, will be only fair to ourselves and the rest of mankind and that will bring nationhood to some of the great lands which she holds in subjection, or as colonies, and put an end, once for all, to that system of conquest and imperialism which has through all the ages deluged the world in blood and carnage and carried in its train misery and ruin to the majority of mankind.

The British Empire to-day, by its very bulk and size, is, as would be any other power under like conditions, a menace to the liberties of the world. Not all the admissions of her ruling class and the puffery of her flatterers and subsidized

spokesmen throughout the world, as to her goodness, can change the fact, that she rules over hundreds of millions of men against their will and for her own selfish interest and advantage. She stays in Ireland and India and Egypt and South Africa only by the right of armed might, and such title no longer has validity among civilized peoples. She holds Canada and Australia through their fears rather than their love. In size and population she is without precedent in the history of the world, and if a stop be not put to her growth, another half century will see her, at the rate at which she has grown for a century past, own and control the whole world.

Were her rule as righteous as her most devoted friends claim it to be, this would not justify or excuse such an end. When, as matter of fact, it cries out to Heaven for vengeance, as it does to-day in Ireland, where she has made a mockery of all the rules of civilized warfare, and is carrying on openly and brazenly a policy of extermination against a liberty-loving people and has resorted in desperation to all the forms of reprisals charged against the worst of the blood-stained figures in her own or any other history, not alone every instinct of our nature and every ideal of our history, but our present and future interest in world peace justify and require action on our part that will put an end to this intolerable blot on civilization. Whether it will be necessary to go beyond recognition of the Republic government that has been established by the vote of three-quarters of the people of that country—even under the form of elections laid down by the British Government itself—in order to bring England to her senses and to stop her on her headlong march to her own ruin and destruction, time alone can tell. But as in the case of Cuba, when Spain was carrying on a campaign of wanton cruelty that aroused against her the conscience of mankind and forced our intervention, so now England must be made to recognize that we will not permit the destruction of a brave people whose only crime is that the possession of their country seems nec-

essary to England's unjust control of the seas of the world—and to her plans to secure for herself that world control which she considers necessary for her interest.

In the interest of permanent peace she must be stopped now in her growth, or there can be no stop. As in nature nothing stands still—she must be not alone stopped, but she must allow peoples to escape from her grasp, as we ourselves escaped, to grow and develop, as we have done, for their own good and the good of all mankind. If she consents to this, either willingly or otherwise, an end can be put to war in any large way and peace will reign among the nations. If she insists upon continuing her imperial policies then, for their common safety, all mankind outside her border, must in self defense, unite against her in order to escape the fate of that third of humanity already swallowed up by her insatiable appetites. We have been promised peace as the result of our unselfish sacrifices in the late war, but it must be a just and lasting peace.

It is not alone sufficient for our welfare that we should keep the fires of war away from our Hemisphere; we must by peaceful penetration reach the markets of the world with our manufactured products.

Our extraordinary growth, within a century and a half, from unsettled territory to the leading country of the world, has brought us face to face with new economic conditions. Our tremendous industrial development has outrun even the growth of our population and of our agriculture—in the sense that we now manufacture in eight months of the year all that our vast population, with its great consuming power, can consume in a year, making us thereby dependent upon the markets of the world for our continued industrial activity throughout the year. We must be content either to slow down our production for one-third of the year, or find markets abroad for the goods which we manufacture in that time. To fail to produce will mean a condition of unemployment for a large portion of our population, and will necessarily be followed by industrial panic, if not by revo-

lution. The alternative is to find a market for the goods which we manufacture, and this can be done only by having those goods sent across the seas to the consuming countries. We cannot compete in the markets of the world with England, unless, in addition to manufacturing goods, we are able to deliver them to the consumer. To do this, in competition with the cheaper labor which England enjoys—and England is our only great commercial competitor—we must carry these goods over the seas in our own ships all over the world. We need a great merchant marine, but its possession will bring upon us the bitter hostility of England.

The immense debt, amounting to nearly forty-five billions of dollars which England now owes, will compel her, if she is to survive economically, to take over the carrying trade of the world in order that she may be enabled to earn the large sums required to pay even the interest upon that debt. So heavy is the burden of taxation upon her population at present that she is staggering under an almost unbearable load in her effort to meet her obligations. With her growing difficulties in other parts of her Empire, as well as with the economic and industrial unrest in England herself, she is dependent, as never before, upon the earnings of her mercantile fleet to enable her to keep afloat, and to save her from being engulfed in bankruptcy. She is faced with the Hobson's choice, in order that she may escape financial ruin, either of securing for herself, with necessary disaster to us, the carrying trade of the world, including the carrying trade of our commerce, or with the disarmament of that navy, through which she holds control of the seas.

The great problem before the peoples of the world today is that of disarmament. No country is more sympathetic to this idea than is ours. To disarm the world, means to put an end to war; to bring nearer the day when the governments of mankind shall be ruled by reason rather than by force; to put an end to tyranny and oppression, and to bring forward a plan of liberty and freedom for all mankind. To bring about the disarmament of the world is to secure the triumph

of American ideals and every red-blooded American hopes, and will strive for the day when such disarmament is possible. Let us do everything possible to bring about this end and to disarm and destroy our navy, if and when the other great nations agree to do the same with their navies. Let us make every reasonable effort to induce all countries to enter into an agreement for world disarmament on sea, and land, and in the air, and let us show our sincerity by agreeing to go as far as the other countries along this path. Nay, let us go further and bring about a conference of all the powers, in order to advocate this plan of action and to accomplish this result.

But if we fail in this work, then, in order to survive, it will be necessary for us to build and construct the greatest navy on earth, as well as the greatest air fleet, in order to insure, not alone for ourselves, but for all the world, that freedom of the seas and of world commerce which is necessary to the economic liberty of mankind. No power, no matter how well intentioned it may declare itself to be, should be longer permitted to have a sea force, or an air force, larger or more powerful than our own. Disguise it as we may, all the lessons of history teach us that every country that has become the commercial competitor of England, has been by force or intrigue, removed from her path. Not one of these countries that in the past have fallen before her diplomatic power, had so many reasons to fear her as we now have. Not one of them had dethroned her from her position of financial world supremacy as we have done. To no one of them has she owed billions of dollars which she was unable to pay, as she now owes to us. Not one of these countries stood alone between her and absolute world domination as we now stand, in that, we are her only great solvent commercial and economic competitor. Let us insist upon, not a truce in the building of naval vessels between her and ourselves, not a holiday from naval construction, but upon either the reduction of her navy to the

actual size of our navy, or the development of our navy to a point at least of equality with hers.

A naval holiday, such as is now proposed, will relieve the countries taking part in it from a great load of taxation and that as an end in itself is a meritorious thing, and one which merits and deserves our sympathy and our support! But a holiday will leave the navies of these countries in the same relative and actual positions in which they now are. It will leave England *alone* with a navy greater than the combined navies of America and Japan—and it will leave the combined navies of England and Japan—and they are bound together at present by the closest ties of alliance—in the position of having a staggering superiority of strength and size over our navy. What we want is not a holiday, but an actual disarmament and destruction of these colossal fleets. If they will not disarm it is because they are preparing for a war with us. Let this be made clear to all the world and let us act accordingly. Remember the sage counsel of Jefferson to Monroe in speaking of the Old World Powers: "They are nations of eternal war."

It is hurled at us from a thousand sides in our own country now that England is our friend—and that it is a crime to talk of the possibility of war with her. In every country which she destroyed the same cry has gone up for years before the hour of destruction came. But what are the facts of history? Where is there an exception to the rule that it is death to a nation to become the rival of England?

Give the people of England credit for the best of intentions with regard to the rest of the world, and the fact remains, that they are powerless to save their commercial and economic rivals from the destruction which the ruling class of England has always brought upon them. Why should we, for whom the lessons of history are so clear, why should we tempt fate and chance meeting the end which has come in the past to every country unfortunate enough to get in the way of the ruling class of England?

We should avoid war, if possible, but let us look the facts squarely in the face. Let us hope for the best but prepare for the worst. If the rulers of England be really our friends let them disarm and render themselves powerless to injure us. But so long as they retain their offensive arms, let us at least make preparations that will prevent our injury and destruction. The career of England warrants us in being on our guard. Our wisest statesmen warned us, in time of peace, to prepare for war. It will be wiser for us to be suspicious of England than to be destroyed by her as have been all her competitors in the past. If she wants peace let her show it by the sincerity of her actions rather than by mere words.

She owes us at this time, in principal and interest, the immense sum of four and a half billions of dollars. At the close of the Napoleonic wars her entire public debt was six billions of dollars. It cost us to fight the Civil War, with all the extravagance and waste, about three and a quarter billions of dollars. England now stands before us, practically admitting her inability to pay her debts to us and asks us for consideration. Let us treat her fairly, but let us be fair to ourselves, before we are generous to others. This debt is overdue. It was advanced in the hour of England's direst stress and by every standard in honor and morals it should be paid at once, in full, with gratitude and appreciation for our generosity, in advancing it to a government whose existence was hanging in the balance and which would not have survived but for it.

If England cannot pay it, let her spokesmen frankly say so, without dissimulation or circumlocution. When that has been done, let us lay down the lines upon which she shall act. If she seeks time in which to pay the debt by instalments, let us lay down the conditions upon which the debt may be funded.

If she seeks to pay the debt by other means than by payment in cash, let us tell her frankly what will satisfy us and, at the same time, help mankind.

Let us insist upon and enforce the payment to us of the huge sums which we advanced to her and to her Allies in her hour of direst stress. And, if, as well may be, she is unable at this time to pay us her portion of this debt in money, let her, as a condition of funding it—give us insurance against destruction by destroying her strategic positions of power which are aimed at us and at us alone. Let her remove herself in every way from the Western Hempishere. Let her give up her grip on Canada. From there as surely as night follows day she will be prepared in the next war, to bombard us with her airships. Let her remove herself entirely from that country, and give it over to its own people, to be governed as an independent country. Let her give up all her vantage points in the West Indies and turn over those islands and her possessions upon the mainland on this hemisphere to the south of us to the peoples to whom they rightly belong, thus removing the menace of her naval power and of her aerial power as far as we are concerned, and freeing all of the Atlantic and Gulf seaports and the Panama Canal from the menace of hostile action on her part.

The annual income upon England's debt to us, at six per cent—and that surely should be the lowest rate at which she might be permitted to fund the debt—is more than a quarter of a billion dollars. Unless we insist upon payment —and up to the present she has not paid even the interest— we have practically given to her more than the cost of her entire fleet, and we are giving her yearly funds with which to carry on her wars of conquest and spoilation in so many parts of the world. How can we escape the charge in history that we have, tacitly at least, become partners in her iniquities and—if her future be as her past—armed her with a terrible weapon with which to destroy our country. Could insanity on our part go further than that? If she seeks to have us cancel her debt to us, then let us consider how she would act under like circumstances.

Were the positions of America and England reversed, can any one who knows the history of England doubt, that

she would compel without delay the settlement upon her own terms of the debts due to her? If we owed billions of dollars to her, that we were unable to pay, and had in our possession a fleet with which her commerce might be threatened or her very existence might be menaced, would she not insist, not upon its destruction but, upon its surrender to her, so that all danger to her might be removed? Why should we not do this very thing to her when conditions are as at present? Is it that we fear such a demand would result in her use of the fleet to attempt to destroy us? Is it that we find no precedent for such action? England has, whenever she could, destroyed the fleets of her rivals—in war whenever and wherever she could, including our own—in peace by treachery, when she dared, as witness the destruction of the Danish fleet, by Nelson at Copenhagen in 1807—a deed which tarnished his fame forever and which made England's name a byword since that time, among lovers of justice and fair play. We are not asking from England now anything but that which she owes to us. She seeks favors—let her pay for them in a manner which accords with American ideals and which will help to end wars and bring peace to a troubled world.

With the surrender to us of the English fleet, or with its destruction—if that in the end were thought to be the wiser course—all danger of another world war will be removed, and we shall have gained that world peace which Wilson so completely missed at Paris.

Nor is it with England alone that we should now make a just settlement. Every one of our debtors—France, Italy, Belgium, should be made to understand that only by doing justice to the peoples whom they oppress can they expect consideration and lenient treatment from us.

There is no reason why Japan should be our enemy. Naturally we move in different worlds—we are almost as far apart as peoples can be.

Assure to her by a doctrine similar to the Monroe Doctrine that white men shall leave the yellow men alone and there can be no war between us. We opened their country

to the world. Why should we turn away the friendship of this great people?

The efforts of many writers and publicists have been for some time past concentrated upon the problem of drawing a line of cleavage between America and Japan. Whose interests are furthered by such an end? Only those of England. The efforts to embroil us are entirely in line with the traditions of English diplomacy. To that end every slight difference of opinion between the two countries has been magnified. Every point of divergence has been emphasized, every molehill has been made into a mountain—in order to bring about a condition of affairs, where these two nations, which are the two nations in strength nearest to England, may be put in position of differing with each other; and if possible, of becoming strongly unfriendly, if not directly and bitterly hostile to each other. Japan has been drawn, so far as possible, into the assertion and defense, as of rights, of small matters as if they were matters of great consequence. She has been made to magnify and center her interest upon questions in the Western Hemisphere to the exclusion of questions of far greater importance in the Eastern Hemisphere. While she has been in this way diverted from giving all her time to questions relating to Asia, England, with ruthless determination and persistence, has been clearing that continent of her opponents and has been endeavoring to strengthen her weakening position in India; to spread her influence in China by such work as her expedition into Thibet; to seize as much as possible of the Near East—Palestine, Mesopotamia and Arabia, and build up her power in Persia, preliminary to taking over that country. If she succeeds in these plans she will have taken over permanently the control of the Southern half of the Continent of Asia with its enormous area and wealth and its population of half of mankind. One of the great tasks of American diplomacy is to have an understanding with Japan which will create an Asiatic equivalent of the Monroe Doctrine and which will let Japan, as well as other nations,

understand clearly, that while America will permit no old world nation to secure political rights or territory in the Western Hemisphere, she herself will seek no political rights or territory in the Eastern Hemisphere.

The great opportunity for doing that will be by giving to the Phillipines their independence, and having such independence, if necessary, guaranteed jointly by our country and Japan. These Japanese are a great, a sensitive and a proud people and have been brought to entertain a sentiment of strong suspicion against us, very largely by our action in taking over the Phillipines at the conclusion of the Spanish-American war. If there were any justification for taking those islands, and their people, at that time, it has long since disappeared. America owes it to humanity, as well as to the Filipinos to give to them their independence —thus not only extending the boundaries of freedom, but opening the door to the establishment of a real understanding between the peoples of the old world and ourselves; by proving in deeds as well as in words, our good faith and our belief that the right of self determination belongs to all the peoples of the world. In return for such action, can there be any doubt that the statesmen of Japan will be very willing to give up their control of those islands lying north of the Equator, and between Japan and us, which have been turned over to her as vantage points from which she may prepare for action against America?

What greater contribution can be made to international law than the establishment of the doctrine of "Asia for the Asiatics"—Asia, greatest of the continents, the place of origin of man—the great land of mystery out of which have come, not alone the human race, but the great religions of mankind and many of the ideas and ideals which have marked the beginning, the progress and the growth of civilization—Asia, the mother to-day of more than half of the population of the world? Why should we not be foremost in assenting to the establishment of a doctrine which will stop the barbarous methods of civilized marauders and con-

querors and leave to the elder peoples the right to determine their own forms of government and to follow their own ideals of development? What, aside from disarmament, will so contribute to the happiness of mankind and what from another angle will so certainly bring about disarmament? The pages of history are covered with stories of cruelty and inhumanity in man's feeble efforts to picture the consequences of wars of conquest and of forced trade expansions. Take from land-robbing nations the opportunity of seizing territory and war and the incentives to war will vanish and disappear.

In case such an understanding be made—with notice thus served upon the great peoples of Asia that we have no designs upon any of their territory—what is more likely than that they will successfully resist the efforts of England to destroy their political independence and to extend her Empire at their expense? What is more likely than that the commercial expansion, which was as strongly recommended to us by Washington and Jefferson as was the political isolation, will be greatly increased, and that the markets of those lands, peopled with almost untold millions of population, will be sympathetically thrown open to us in such a way as to tremendously increase the business which we have heretofore done with them? Such action on our part will undoubtedly not alone satisfy the ideals and appeal to the interests of the peoples of Asia, but will insure to Canada and Australia, more strongly than does the English fleet, protection from unfriendly designs upon them by any of the Asiatic governments. It will tend to divert Japanese immigration from any part of the Western Hemisphere and from Australia, and to direct it, with friendly intent, into the Phillipines or the other Asiatic islands, or to the continent of Asia itself. It will tend to restore the old time friendship between us and Japan, and to destroy for all time the suspicions which the adroit agents of England have created, and in that way, add to our security; to world peace; and to our moral leadership of mankind.

But even without her navy England will still be a force to reckon with on this continent.

The extraordinary development of the airship makes necessary a new view of the value of air power. Prudent, provident and far seeing—England has already arrived at the conclusion that future wars will largely be fought by the aeroplane and by the submarine. Accordingly, even in all her financial troubles, she has spent hundreds of millions of dollars last year in making experiments in the conquest of the air and in preparing a powerful air fleet, ready for all contingencies. Just as we must urge disarmament upon sea and land, and insist upon it by all the arguments of persuasion and appeals to reason that we can bring forth, so must we urge it as to the air, and if this does not avail, we must insist upon the construction of such an air fleet as will enable us to lead mankind in that direction! It is a matter of common knowledge that great preparations have been made in England in this line of activity, and throughout the Empire there is general wonder as to the purpose of the Imperial Conference to be held in London in the coming June for the discussion of the question of Imperial defense under the chairmanship of Winston Churchill, the man responsible for the Gallipoli fiasco and for the ill-starred English misadventures in Mesopotamia. It is to him that Lloyd George has now turned over the job of fooling the colonies with the belief that they are nations while all questions affecting their interests are decided for them by a handful of the ruling class in London.

Nay, even in Canada the immense preparations for aerial warfare made at Camp Borden, near Barrie, in the Province of Ontario, have excited astonishment, and wonder as to what may be the purpose and intention of such gigantic preparations. The Canadian Great War Veterans have recently objected to Mr. Guthrie, the Minister of Militia, against his action in going to England to get English war veterans to go to Canada as recruits for service in that country. Our statesmen should not alone ask against whom these

preparations are being made, but insist upon knowing, and insist upon the demolition of such works as have been prepared against us. No matter how ingenuously England may argue that she must keep up some semblance of a fleet upon the sea in order to protect herself against her continental European rivals, even her ingenuity canot explain how or why a great air fleet upon the American continent can be used against Europe here, and any such fleet must have as its end a use against our country.

A bird's-eye view of the map of the northern part of our country and of the southern part of Canada, will show at once the extraordinary difference between the damage or ruin that can be done to either country by the armed hostility of the other. Where we have a succession almost from East to West of great cities, within striking distance of the border, Canada has practically no cities of consequence. The damage that hostile expeditions by Canada could inflict upon America is incalculable, while the extent to which, granting there were war, we could injure Canada is very slight. These things must be taken into account, but it is probably upon the side of commercial growth and expansion that most care and thought should be expended by those who have charge of our foreign affairs. In the new development of our country, every successive year, by reason of our growth in manufacturing plants and productive activities, will make greater our dependence upon foreign markets. Wonderful as have been our strides in the growth of population and of territory, they do not compare with our growth in economic and commercial productiveness. Our markets must increase if we are to survive. We must reach the consuming peoples all over the world in order that we may continue to grow, or even to survive. To do that we must be on the friendliest of political relations with all the great consuming peoples, in order that we may have close and profitable commercial relations with them. It is a policy little short of criminal that has shut our country out from the Russian and German markets up to this

time. The peoples of those countries run into hundreds of millions, in numbers; and are actually in want of things which we produce in great quantities. It is of no use to produce unless we can find a market in which that product may be consumed, and there is no place on earth, or no markets from which we should permit ourselves to be shut out. The new administration should without delay, take such steps as will enable us to resume our trade relations with these great peoples and restore to us the rights of commerce of which we have been too long deprived.

The foreign policy of the United States is not alone simple but it is the evolution—the necessary and natural outgrowth and development—of the policy adopted at the birth of our country. It was initiated and created by the founders of our government. It began with the country, has grown and developed with it, is an essential part of it and expands and unfolds with our growth quite as naturally as do the petals of the flower as it comes to maturity. Washington and Jefferson outlined its early application and their successors in turn have had but to apply it as time passed.

No mistakes have been made by those who followed the policy of the early leaders—grave disaster, if not destruction would have followed its abandonment if the nation had been foolish enough to follow Wilson in his wanderings, when he was led from the path of sturdy Americanism, and "like a certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers who also stripped him, and having wounded him, went away, leaving him half dead."

The American foreign policy has but grown with the growth of our country—placed upon splendid and firm foundations by the genius of Washington and Jefferson and their associates. It rests upon a few simple but all embracing foundations; the doctrine of no entangling alliances and of isolating ourselves politically from contact and alliance with old world powers, while maintaining and strengthening our commercial relations with all mankind; the Mon-

roe Doctrine, which in its final analysis, will dedicate this continent in whole, and not alone in part to liberty; the doctrine that the seas belong to mankind and not to any one nation, and that there must be absolute freedom of intercourse thereon between all the nations; the fact that we must have disarmament on land and sea and in the air—and if the other nations will not disarm then that we must outarm them.

The natural outgrowth of these policies is the doctrine of sympathy and of help—of having friendly interest in, not alone all our sister nations of the new world, between whom and us no differences should be permitted to exist, but also all the smaller and weaker peoples of the world. Let us protect and extend our means of communicating with them by commerce, by sea and by air, by mail, by cable and by any and all other methods that the inventive genius of our people may evolve. Let us insist upon free seas—free to the mercantile ships of all nations—in war for non-belligerents as well as in peace—and free to travelers without English passports or permits. With this foreign policy, which has grown naturally with the institutions of America and which is as much their consequence as are the unbounded strength and marvelous development which have come to us in every line of internal growth, we must brook no interference from outside. Let us insist that no foreign government, great or small, shall be permitted to carry on its intrigues against us within our shores, or endeavor to attempt to set our house in disorder by dividing our people into racial or religious factions. We have reached the period of full growth.

We are able, without interference or dictation from without, to settle, not alone our external policies but our internal problems and affairs. The administration which supports this time honored American policy, which holds us free and far from all entangling alliances of any sort with the old world powers, which enables us to insist upon and protect our rights throughout the world, to broaden and

extend the Monroe Doctrine so as to free the Hemisphere from European influences, to protect our shores from invasion and to extend our trade relations with all who desire to carry on commercial intercourse with us, which adopts a policy of non-interference in Asia and settles once for all our relations with Japan upon a solid foundation of sympathy, peace and cordial understanding and works to establish permanent peace by taking power from those who would weaken it, will deserve well of the nation, and will continue in power, because it will represent the hopes and beliefs and aspirations of the vast majority of the people of America.

Let it fail, or falter in this work; let it attempt to entangle us in any of the selfish schemes of government of the old world, or fail to defend us in the onward march of our political and economic growth, or to maintain our highest ideals, our broadest interests; and the traditional American policy of help and sympathy to all who struggle for liberty, and it will go out of office—as it deserves to go—with possibly even a greater burden of dissatisfaction and contempt than the administration which has just been so decisively rebuked at the polls.

ADDENDUM

[Since the foregoing article was written, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Chancellor of the Exchequer of England, made his famous declaration that England had already asked the United States to cancel the English indebtedness and that we had refused to do so—and Mr. Houston, Secretary of the Treasury, after some prodding, admitted that such request had been made.

On Tuesday, February 8th, according to the cable despatches, an English official "near the Foreign Office and well known in Anglo-American circles" said that the United States and Great Britain are "drifting towards a break" and "are treading the path leading to war." Alarmed by the American reaction to the publication, the English have tried to explain it away, but no direct denial has been or can be made because it is now tacitly admitted that Sir Auckland Geddes made the statement. The questions of first importance with us are—is the fact true, and what are we going to do about it? Sir Auckland Geddes has returned to our shores. Can we with self-respect continue to receive him as Ambassador?

The matter of the repayment to us of the foreign governments' debts is assuming great prominence. Senators and Representatives are awakening to a realization of the importance to us of removing the West Indies and Canada as dangers and turning them into friendly and sympathetic nations and neighbors.

What would Washington and Jefferson; what would Monroe or Lincoln do under the circumstances? Fate knocks at our doors. Is Harding to be another of the "American Immortals" or just a successor to Wilson?

HAS AMERICA A LITERATURE?

By THOMAS L. MASSON

THIS question has been asked and answered so often, that somebody who doesn't know too much about it should have something to say. We have heard from all the experts—including foreign celebrities and native intelligensia—why not from the ignoramuses? Every great question is ultimately settled by the ignoramuses: why not this one?

And after all it isn't so much a question as to whether America has a literature, as to whether any other country has a literature compared with the one we have?

Literature, as I understand it, is something we put away in books in our libraries, refer to occasionally, as if we knew something about it, but never read. A few people in every generation who have been generally classified under the term "Highbrow" keep literature alive by writing about it as if they were reading it themselves. This was all very well under the old system of kings and queens when the idlers about the court had little else to do but to read their own poems and plays to one another. When a thing thus written was decided to be good it was stamped with the approval of the committee in charge and by this automatic process became known as literature. After this nobody dared to deny that it was literature. The word had been passed around and future generations duly notified of the decision. Some of the dullest books in the world have, therefore, become classics, which no sane man in the possession of his senses would think of reading through. As for the poor old populace, they were too busy keeping body and soul together to know anything about it and were naturally compelled

to accept what the charmed circle declared was literature. But they never read it, any more than they wore court suits. They admired the court suits from a respectful distance, and were probably deluded into the belief that the men inside of those court suits were supermen, just as we poor ignoramuses today have come to think that critics are abnormally intelligent, and speak of them in awed whispers, because they distribute high-sounding opinions about authors that nobody actually reads.

There is indeed no form of subtle hypocrisy quite like an assemblage of smart words and phrases in the hands of a literary highbrow. And the women! How they fall for it. When Professor Bergson came over here several years ago all the nice people and all the literary idlers flocked in crowds to hear him talk. He had invented a new system of creative philosophy and that was quite enough. Nobody understood a word of what he said. He spoke of the stream of your consciousness as if it were like the alimentary canal and could be handled in two-foot lengths and checked up with the cosmic law, whatever that is. He gravely dissected humor, and didn't even get a laugh. If he had got a laugh, he would have been discredited. It is fatal for anybody with a literary reputation to maintain to be amusing. When you become so interesting that you make people forget that what you say has no moral attached to it and is intended only to divert their attention so they may become accustomed to the contact of all that is beautiful in the world—that of course is not literature. If this sort of thing were admitted to be the best literature, the highbrows would vanish. Their reputation with the masses depends on putting the stamp of their approval upon something which an ordinary human being doesn't understand, and, if he did understand it, would not think of reading. From the highbrow standpoint, what the multitude wants must be bad on its face.

The fact is, however, that there is no excuse for literature unless it is interesting to the majority who know how to read. And there is no excuse for it unless it is interesting

to those who don't know how to read. You can read it to them and if it doesn't interest them it isn't literature. Hi Diddle Diddle and the cow that jumped over the moon is not literature from the literary standpoint. I can prove to you in 40,000 words of great writing and astonishing cleverness that no cow ever jumped over any moon. And it isn't altogether that, either. A cow can be made to jump over a moon, of course, if he does it in a manner prescribed by the literary critics. It isn't essential to be correct in your facts to write highbrow literature. Quite the contrary. It is only necessary to be dull, to slather with words whatever ideas you may be assumed to have, to create an illusion of high art or vague emotional technique. Nobody really knows what technique is, except that it is something to be developed. If you have technique you can pass the censor. In the mean time when we want to keep the children out of mischief on a rainy afternoon, keep them from pulling all the paper off the wall, and knocking the varnish off the furniture, we read them "Mother Goose." "Mother Goose" is a standing menace to the critics. Her meter is bad, her images are distorted, and her language is so simple that any child can understand it. That's enough to damn it. As for its intense vulgarity nobody with high art tendencies or a nice sense of literary values can think of the little pig that went to market without a shudder. It is something to be enjoyed only by a chiropodist.

And so the real literature of America is understood by nobody because we have all become so cowed by the critics that nobody dares to say what it really is and that it is quite different from anything that any other country has. The mass of stuff that passes for literature lies over the real literature in much the same manner that the city cobblestones shut out the grass and the wild flowers that spring up from the soil, we know not how or why. A large part of this stuff is imported and we have come to believe that it belongs to us and we display it to the world as if it were our own child. A large proportion of American writers are

echoes. They not only copy the style and method of British writers, but their whole process of development is artificial, because the sources of their inspiration are borrowed from elsewhere.

But right here it is necessary to make a distinction, to draw a sharp line between the common language that we share with the mother country and our own native expression, as it arises spontaneously and irresistibly from our soil. Thus our British friends who come over here to examine us closely are fond of saying that there is an American language and they are quite correct in that instinct that leads them to admire most those men among us who have succeeded, even in part, in breaking through the barriers of English tradition. On the other hand, it must be noted that real literature is not alone a matter of geography and climate, springing spontaneously from the soil, but is universal where it rises from fundamental human impulses, no matter at what period of time or upon what spot of earth the utterer may be. Thus if we compare the Funeral Oration of Pericles over the graves of the Athenian soldiers with the Gettysburg Address of Lincoln we are astonished at the similarity, because there are certain things in human nature that time does not alter. In our case, also, we must not fail to take into account our mixed population where so many aliens have come to settle on our soil.

There is one thing more. Many of our most vociferous critics indeed are, if not foreign-born themselves, of foreign extraction and are even more un-American in their utterances than if they lived elsewhere. They have saturated themselves with foreign traditions and have kept themselves immune to the native atmosphere, loudly proclaiming its crudeness and intensive vulgarity. These literary highbrows go by the old rule handed down by the court idlers, that literature must not only be exclusive, but be complex and long. Now any so-called literature is long—even if it consist of a few pages—if it is dull. The tendency among most of our writers, when they have an idea, is to string it out.

Instead of giving the idea at once, simply and directly, and then leaving it they assume that nobody will have the intelligence to understand it unless it is led up to, used as a climax to a process of up-building that they are pleased to term literary art, when it is in reality only commercialism: because the necessity of making a good living under artificial pressure depends not only upon the rate per word, but the number of words. Thus a writer says to me as an editor time and again: "I cannot afford to put this idea in your limited space, because I can string it out and get four times, or ten times what you offer me from someone else." That is not only a practical fact but it is natural. What we spend in money is out of all proportion to what we need, and the day of reckoning for this sort of thing will surely come.

Genuine literature, on the contrary, is always short. It is always as short as it can be made. When you get beyond the length of one of Shakespeare's plays, you are in the long grass. So the real literature of America is not to be discovered in interminable essays, or vapid re-writings of character analysis, but in logoi, or sayings. The sayings of Christ do not have to be rewritten in the language of some modern literary artist for every passing generation. They have been so rewritten in lengthy screeds and expositions, and have always fallen dead. The modern novel as it has been developed from the time of Richardson is real literature only so far as it has given a series of pictures of human life. It is not so much literature as it is history. It is literature only so far as the author succeeds, to speak colloqually, in touching the high spots. Thus when we speak of any one of Dickens' novels, we don't speak of books as a whole, but we tell something that one of the characters has said. What real American literature consists of certain utterances that have sprung from the soil, certain things which blossom out of purely American conditions, as when Lincoln remarked that you could fool all of the people some of the time, etc.

As soon as we begin to grow lengthy and verbose we do not depend upon ourselves; we fall back on the mass of

literary tradition that has been labeled out to us from infancy. It is true, of course, that what may be termed literary form such as Aristotle's rules about the writing of Drama, are true in all ages, just as we have never been able to discover anything in architecture better than the Greek. And it is interesting, in connection with this, to note that even in the make-up of some of our best magazines the mathematical principles of the Greeks are now being studied and followed. If there are so many steps leading up to the Greek Parthenon and if the height of the columns is regulated to the proportionate size of the whole structure, then there are so many lines to the modern magazine page in proportion to its size, and in an illustration the proportion of black is regulated to the proportion of grey or neutral as one-quarter to three-quarters.

So far as all this is concerned, it may be freely admitted without in anyway disturbing the truth that our literature must be our own, must contain nothing superfluous, must be simple, fundamental, short and blossom out of American soil. There is real literature in our baseball talk and in many of our advertising slogans, because these things are peculiar to us. Beyond this lies the slow development of form. The country is young yet, more or less hybrid—a melting pot. In the long run of things, it hasn't been beaten up enough. In its geographical safety it has been too isolated, too much attracted to its own material growth. This will pass in time. And then again America has, in its way, a new idea, of which the Greeks knew nothing, and Germany has apparently learned nothing. It is the idea of national sacrifice for the betterment of mankind in general; not new in the sense that it has not been thought of before but new in a vision—more or less obscured—of practical application. Faint and hidden away under a lot of material things, but there.

The skeptics say it isn't there. But it is. Those who come after us, as Kipling has well said, will be astonished that we could not have seen its birth clearer.

Every human being, if there is anything to him at all, must work out his destiny without fear or favor. He must not seek a temporary crutch by borrowing from others, thus weakening himself in the future. He must hew himself through a series of mistakes, learning something from each one. He will be crude and vulgar, he will sit in his shirt sleeves, he will sleep with his boots on, he will laugh discordantly at swinish horse play, he will delight in chromos and silly sentimentality—but it is only by cutting through these things (over which the literary dilettanti lift their delicate hands in horror) fearlessly that he can finally come to his own and achieve form. There is no other path.

ASIA

By YENOMDRAH MALA

To Occidental:

Mystic land of benighted slumber,
Content in dreams aeons vanward;
A maelstrom of B. C. pagans,
And ludicrous gods;
A background for fictional tales,
Dire, creepy and mysterious,
And crimes barbarous;
Viewed afar, a narcotized giant;
Beheld at hand, a sundered Something—
Unknown.

To Asia-ite:

Land of epochal Dawns,
Multifarious, and Creation-reaching;
Fountain-source of philosophies, cultures, religions,
Age-seasoned, world-strewn, and enduring;
Storehouse of agglomeratic treasure,
Foreign-coveted,
And bartered for with jeers;
Land of the Misunderstood;
Land of the patient Understanding;
And . . . Home.

EDITORIAL TABLE

MR. HARDING'S RESPONSIBILITIES

WARREN G. HARDING becomes the twenty-ninth President of the United States under circumstances that make his task particularly difficult and his responsibility great. It might be said by the proponents of the *laissez faire* philosophy that every president has entered into office confronted with grave responsibilities, and yet no man ever elected has disgraced the country or actually retarded its progress.

It is true that the American people are a singularly buoyant, self-reliant and recuperative people, and it is true that being a resourceful people with endless resources, they have always been willing to take the mistakes of the past on their own shoulders and have given little time to considering what might have happened had their foresight been as acute as their hindsight. The mistakes of our presidents have been many, but we have been able to afford them all apparently, even though some of those mistakes have taken toll in the blood of our youth.

But there comes a time when even the richest country on earth must tread with caution. There is no such thing known to the human mind as endless resources. There is no such thing as unfathomable riches and unlimited capacity for dissipation. The Great War, with its many lessons that will come not to this generation, but to others, has shown how little is man's boasted civilization before the holocaust. Had America declared war against Germany when she invaded Belgium, or even later, when the *Lusitania* was sunk, what pages of progress rather than slaughter might not have been written. Man's doom is in his hands while the moerae go on spinning, disposing and making much of his mistakes.

With such power in one man's hands, with a country as trusting and as willing to be led, with democracy itself under attack, not alone by those who fear it, but by those who should favor it, there seems justification for saying that the new president's task is difficult and his responsibility unusual.

The measure of each president's responsibility, or rather we should say the measure of his success, is an understanding of the faults and virtues of his predecessors. We need no greater example of the failure of one president to avail himself of the experience of his predecessor than President Taft, whose desire to be "different" split the republican party. In President Wilson, Mr. Harding has a predecessor whose international policies are conspicuously safe warnings. The verdict of the American people in November, 1920, was an emphatic protect against all of Mr. Wilson's foreign dealings, despite the fact that some of the Republican leaders were not as clear-seeing as the great mass of the voters with lesser opportunities than the leaders for understanding the traditions of their country.

But if Mr. Wilson's handling of our foreign affairs was distasteful to

Americans, and the opposite of his course is a safe course for Mr. Harding, there is no reason whatever of value that his purely domestic policies should not be studied with care, especially as they relate to an understanding of the people. And in his domestic policies Mr. Wilson must be given credit for many things, not the least of which was the preachment of democracy. He gathered about him a cabinet of small men that he might, without craning, talk over their heads to the people. He became obsessed by his own historical vision of himself, to the point that he forgot about the rest of the government of which he was a part, but he got people reading what he wrote and said and discussing his "style," more than did any previous president, not excepting Roosevelt himself, whom the people loved as they did not love Wilson. The people became accustomed to hearing directly from their president, and he did it well, whether seemingly addressing Congress or a foreign nation, did it with artful touches of apparent self-revelation, did it benignly and kindly while the people listened believingly, as a child listens to the ticking of a watch.

For Mr. Wilson was a phrase juggler, a dealer in paradox; but the fact that he did address himself to the people, not frequently, but always, without the intermedia of this or that White House spokesman, gave him such a grip on the public mind that if it had not been for the courage of the Senate he would have rallied the nation to even his fateful League of Nations.

Mr. Harding, therefore, has to consider that he succeeds a man who has for eight years accustomed the people to hearing from their president. They will be more demanding and more critical of him than if his predecessor had been less deft. They will want, as time goes on, to hear from him something about his "mind" (Mr. Wilson having told them much about his mind), and perhaps something of his "heart" will also be expected, Mr. Wilson having accustomed them to hear that tick, too.

Mr. Harding's cabinet, if not a brilliant one, is so far above Mr. Wilson's in brains and intelligence as to make hasty criticism unjust. At least there are in it two men of Presidential size, showing a more human attitude toward his cabinet than Mr. Wilson has ever shown. The members will not be criticised for sheer lack of intelligence. If anything, they will be criticized by the opposition for their shrewd knowledge of politics and for a tendency toward considering the political rather than the purely governmental aspects of policies.

We are hearing now entirely too much of the superficial ebullitions about the supremacy of party government. They are more or less inevitable after eight years of one-man rule, but thoughtful men know that that is best party government which is not so openly and which is not too brazenly an endeavor to build up party. The Republican party has never been so strong as it was in 1908, after the eight years of Theodore Roosevelt, never so weak as 1912, after the four years of Mr. Taft. The one built his party by making it representative of the people. The latter injured it by trying to follow a few leaders who believed that they constituted the party and that all the rest were leather and prunella. Every little reactionary is piping about party, the real backbone of the party is aching for more talk about policies and ideas. In the front rank of those proclaiming the grand return of partisan government are principally those who were all wrong on the great international issues that decided the election and

are hoping by that loud shouting for the good old times to obliterate the memory of their mental and political obliquity.

The Harding government will have to be progressive if it is successful. We believe that the big men in the cabinet will see this as they get into the actual work of governing, for they are able men and not one of them could be called stupid. Hughes will surely see it; we believe Weeks will. Hays has had too much direct contact with the sentiment of the country to be other than progressive. Daugherty is too shrewd a politician to avoid the facts.

It is in their common sense that we have hope. If they bring not large statesmen-like qualities, or great scholarship, or profound or varied culture, they will bring developed mentalities and the power of application. Their contribution to the political literature of the country will not be brilliant, but to the country's difficulties and problems their application will be keen and persistent.

NOTE TO FORUM READERS—The publisher of THE FORUM desires to express regret to its readers who have received through careless printing imperfect copies of the December, January and February issues. Arrangements have been made for the future to remedy this unpardonable carelessness.

DISCUSSIONS ON NEW BOOKS

GREAT MEN AT CLOSE RANGE

DRAMATIC, graphic, breathless, in a way, is Stephan Lauzanne's series of pen-pictures of the men who have gone to make history in the past ten years. ("Great Men and Great Days," D. Appleton & Co.) There is not a dull line in this story of the men the future ages will discuss and analyze. But there are many lines that are too sweeping, too emotional, too unrestrained.

The story of the great men of these past years of turmoil begins very properly with the part Theophile Delcassé played in the making of France. It was Delcassé who, when he took the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1898, set himself to do what then seemed an impossible task; to straighten out all the French differences with England. Hardly had he set himself to this undertaking than the Fashoda incident came, and it looked as if France instead of a new entente with England would be obliged to go to war to defend the actions of her representatives. But Delcassé was a statesman who did not hesitate to retreat when he knew he was wrong or when greater things were at stake than an immediate victory of no moment. He chose deliberately to have England as an ally rather than to be the pawn of Germany, and in that he had the same vision that George Brandes had in a larger way, as is related in another part of this month's issue of THE FORUM. When Delcassé fell he knew it was the power of greed and pelf that had brought about his downfall, and not the forces that were working for the best interests of his own country. An interview with him

immediately after his downfall brings back the interesting story of that period, and the author very properly concludes his pen picture by saying that "history will say whether or not the man who wielded the allies into a block of granite by the Treaty of London and not the man who prepared the way for France's victory over her historic and bitter enemy."

There is another graphic picture of "Papa" Joffre and Poincare, and then a very interesting sketch and analysis of our retiring President, Mr. Wilson. There is much in it that is fair to Mr. Wilson. Some of it is quite unfair. Superficially it is true that all of the President's errors may be traceable to those habits of mind that were acquired during his years of acting as a professor in a university, but actually his mistakes and his failures were due to the fact that while he has written some of the most interesting articles and statements about democracy, Mr. Wilson is not really a believer in government by the majority. The faults of the author show more clearly when we come to his analysis of the man that most Americans knew intimately, or at least felt that they knew intimately, and that was Theodore Roosevelt. The author sees his greatness, but as may be expected with a foreigner, his attention is concentrated on what might be called his superficial characteristics, which, to many seemed like eccentricities.

But it would be unfair to go into these details in a book that is interesting from beginning to end and that in quick flashes opens up to us the great figures of the stormy days. For this we are ready to forgive him many snap judgments. Some of them have an amusing side, such as the statement that Mr. Frank Simmons is America's leading journalist. There's a little log rolling there.

NEGRO PROBLEMS RESTATED

IN "The Soul of John Brown" by Stephan Graham (The Macmillan Company, New York, 1920), for students of the Negro problem in America, there is restated in fairly interesting fashion many angles of the problem already well known to them. For readers less familiar with the subject the ignorant and narrow-minded provincialism of a certain type of southern opinion, as shown in numerous quoted statesments given by Mr. Graham, will be startling and disheartening. This narrative of the travel of Mr. Graham in the wake of General Sherman would seem to prove rather conclusively that the South as a whole needs education and educational facilities badly for both its white and black citizens. This need will be met of course when that section becomes more fully developed industrially and agriculturally. Wide development of the natural resources of the South will inevitably call for better training and organization of its cheap and untrained labor. The so-called race problem will then more properly be looked upon as a problem in economics and be dealt with as such as men more interested in achieving results than in maintaining the existing order by slavish worship of the sentimental and outworn traditions which at present so largely control conditions in that section.

Mr. Graham goes to the heart of his problem when in Virginia he discovers that "It would be a mistake to think of this American problem as exclusively a Negro problem." This statement is followed by some interesting conclusions

which we cannot argue here. The author seems to have absorbed the point of view of a certain class of southern white, and to a less extent, of the southern black. He confesses an inability to put himself wholly *en rapport* with Negroes.

Commenting on his attempt to speak to a Negro congregation, he says, "It was a strange sensation that of the Negro congregation. I could find no *touch,* no point of contact, could indeed take nothing from *them.* The spiritual atmosphere was an entirely different one from that of a gathering of whites. I should have been inclined to say that there was no spiritual atmosphere whatever. For me it was like speaking to an empty room and a vast collection of empty seats. But I know there was something there, though I could not realize it." This is a curious admission and a perplexing statement. I doubt whether any Negro speaker has ever felt that way in speaking to a white audience. Negro speakers have a reputation for winning white audiences. This is especially true of Negro preachers as anyone who has ever heard of C. T. Walker's church and his large following of white worshippers in Augusta, Georgia, will readily testify.

The emphasis which Mr. Graham puts upon the sensuality and bestial aspects of the problem makes one doubt the appropriateness of his title, at times. He might easily have called his book, "The Soul of Ben Tillman or Jeff Davis" and come closer to describing its content.

His chapter on "The World Aspect" comes nearer to the spirit of his title than any other in the book. He speaks with great truth when he says: "The Negro's chief danger lies in a consensus of evil opinion about him. . . . Out of a cycle of happenings is derived the thought: No one can afford to feel virtuous about the Negro . . . it shuts out a good deal of hope which might have been derived from white sympathy, and it threatens the colored people as a whole with worse things to be. These are the days of democracies and white proletariats and both show themselves less friendly toward Negroes and 'natives' than the old monarchies. Their hostility is based on old fashion ignorant

contempt; competition in the labor market, and a sort of fear. Probably it can be overcome in time . . ."

God help America if it should ever become entirely true that no white American can afford to feel virtuous about the Negro! White Americans of this and future generations must and will deny this by their more enlightened attitude and actions. They will do it in the South. Witness Mr. Graham's own Mr. Bolton Smith of Memphis who already sees farther ahead than some of his friends. There are others. There will be more. Possibly the work of Mr. Graham will help some of them to see the challenge of this most important phase of the problem of racial relationships which America faces to-day. She must face it with hope, with broad sympathy, courage and intelligence if the Stars and Stripes are to wave o'er the land of the free for her future generations.

A. L. JACKSON.

SEA POWER

By Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske

THE story of the conquest of the sea is a story far older than any which recorded history relates, but knowledge of how greatly that conquest has influenced man's destiny has only recently been granted to us. For it was not until Admiral Mahan wrote his epochal book "The Influence of Sea Power on History" that even historians realized fully how much sea commerce had done to make civilization possible, how much naval power had done to make sea commerce possible, and how sea commerce and naval power had acted together to influence the progress of the

world. Mahan dealt with the subject historically, analytically and thoroughly; and in one book of moderate size, he proved his case so conclusively that only the mildest of protests have gone up since against his sweeping declarations.

Because of the obvious limits of human intelligence and especially of imagination, men do not see very far ahead of them in point of time, or very far in any direction in point of space. Perhaps 90 per cent. of the energy of most animals, including human animals, is spent in the engaging occupation of earning a living; 90 per cent. of their interest centers about it, and 90 per cent. of their attention is fastened on the immediate and the obvious. Thus, it is the things that happen near us which attract our notice, even though things more important are happening farther away; and it is for reasons like these that history has occupied itself almost exclusively with events upon the land, mentioning sea-happenings only incidentally, and in order to fill in the outlines of their pictures. It was not until the year 1890, when history had been at work for five thousand years recording facts, that the real importance of sea power was made patient to the world by Alfred T. Mahan.

Mahan, though he dealt with the rise and the influence of sea power historically, laid the greatest emphasis on the lessons that he wished to teach, and sketched in the historical features in outline only. This was to be expected of course; for the reason that he was not writing a history of sea power, but an essay on its influence. Because of the attention attracted by him to sea power, and because no history of sea power existed, a gap has existed since, which plainly should be filled. Professors Stevens and Westcott ("A History of Sea Power" (Doran)) now fill it with a highly important and attractive book.

They present us with stirring moving pictures of those days in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf, more than two thousand years before Christ, when the galleys of commerce and the galleys of war sped over the warm blue waters; the former propelled mainly by means of sails,

and the latter mainly by means of oars. They show us how the fleets of Crete and Phœnicia and Egypt and Assyria carried the wares of their merchants to other lands; and how, in especial, the Phœnicians acted as carriers between the high civilizations of Western Asia and the semi-barbarism of Greece and the countries west of Greece; and how they transported the products of the weaver and the potter and the artificer to men and women waiting for them, and took in return metals and other raw materials. They show that commerce then was in essentials the same as commerce now.

They also show that, while material things were the most obvious articles of transportation, yet that immaterial things were transported also, such as language, customs, laws, and even thoughts; and they make it as clear as can be that it was by the sea, and by the sea alone, that civilization was spread to Europe from West Asia. They show, furthermore, that it was the gift of civilization thus received which gave Greece the base from which she started, to achieve the still higher civilization which she later transmitted to the world.

The book treats not only of sea commerce, however, but of the gradual development of the seaman's art, by the aid of inventions and discoveries, mainly of a mechanical kind; and it treats also of the progress of the naval art, the art of fighting on the sea. The principal sea battles are described, beginning with the epochal battle of Salamis, which the authors prove to have been one of the most important battles for the spread of civilization that was ever fought. The book narrates entertainingly the story of the later sea battles between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians, between Rome and Carthage, between Octavius and Mark Anthony, and between the Christians and the Turks; and it makes us see clearly the importance to all the world of the failure of the Spanish Armada, sent against England by Phillip II.

The expeditions of Columbus, Vasco da Gama and Magellan, and the researches of Prince Henry the Navigator, are dealt with in turn; and then our attention is called to

their compelling influence on all later times. In the great rush for sea commerce with the rich lands discovered, wars were brought about; and the point is made distinctly that the superior sea power of England enabled her to triumph over Spain, Holland and France in turn, and achieved not only the title, but the right, to "Mistress of the Seas."

The World War is dealt with at length, and the battle of Jutland distinctly described. Had the authors been content to deal with that battle, and with previous battles, as historians only, the present reviewer would have only praise in his treatment of this book. But, like most other laymen who write about naval subjects, they have allowed themselves to assume the role of strategists. As a result, they have criticized naval commanders with a freedom and force that would surprise a naval officer, if he had not become hardened to such performances. The confident manner in which the authors discuss the doings of the great admirals of ancient and modern times, and deal praise here and condemnation there, would be ridiculous if it were not important.

Why is it important?

Because it truly reflects the attitude of the American people toward the naval profession. Men who would not dare to pass judgment on the professional acts of great surgeons, or great lawyers, or great men in any profession with which they are measurably familiar, feel thoroughly equipped to pass judgment on the acts of great admirals who have been, or who now are, at the heads of a profession with which they, the critics, are immeasurably unfamiliar. There is no other profession in the world so wholly different from every other, so peculiar, so esoteric as the naval profession. It is impossible for any man not thoroughly familiar with it to have it appear to him otherwise than as a blur. Yet, by reason of a curious defect of the human mind, any achievement, or any work, or any profession seems easy to us, *provided that we are so wholly ignorant of it that we do not know its difficulties.*

It is because of this mental defect that the British, French and Americans handed over the management of their navies and armies to civilians untrained in their management, and were almost beaten to pieces by the comparatively little nation of Germany, in consequence.

INVALID EUROPE

By E. JEROME HART

ONE of the consecrated phrases of pre-war journalism was "the Sick Man of Europe," which, of course, applied to Turkey. Now the whole of Europe is sick and suffering, and many are attempting to diagnose the disease and prescribe the remedy. Already numerous books have been written upon the subject, and doubtless there will be many more. So far no writer has succeeded quite so well as the author of "Invalid Europe" (Boni and Liveright) in describing graphically and comprehensively actual, present day conditions in Europe, in tracing them to their origin and cause, and finally in pointing to the remedy.

Like Maynard Keynes, Alfred F. Seligsberg, who has written this book, is clear sighted and courageous, but unlike Keynes he deals with facts and eschews figures. A professional man, residing in New York, Mr. Seligsberg knows his Europe as do few Americans, for he was educated there, imbibed its culture before going to Harvard, and has since regularly visited it, while he is exceptionally well acquainted with European languages and literature. This much we learn from an interesting Foreword, and also that the author was in Europe when the war broke out, and watched the mobilization in France after his return there from Germany in August, 1913. He was thus able to gauge the sentiments of both countries in regard to the pending

conflict, and to realize to what extent Germany willed and France sought to avert it.

The author of "Invalid Europe" is no partizan. His is the rôle of the dispassionate and compassionate judge. He sees things just as they are, looking at them from various sides, without becoming confused or indeterminate in his conclusions and judgments. He has a gift of vivid description and terse summary, and, though his book is necessarily controversial, he so marshals his facts and makes his deductions as to keep the reader thoroughly interested. He is no more lenient towards the arrogance, militarism and materialism of Germany than he is with respect to the chauvinism of France and that country's neglect, even in the day of her present needs, of her dwindling birth rate. Profoundly sympathising as he does with France in her sufferings, he does not mince words in his references to the control of the French Government and press by the banks and financiers. And while vigorously rebutting the aspersions cast upon Italy with regard to her motives in ultimately entering the war, and saying many handsome things about that country, he roundly condemns the annexation of the Tyrol, and reminds Italy of the lesson furnished by her own formerly unredeemed provinces.

What is the malady from which Europe is suffering today? Mr. Seligsberg says it is homicidal mania. To quote his words, "The European Continent today is a seething hell of hate; life is oppressed by a pall of vindictiveness and mutual distrust. Wherever one goes each country seems to hate some other country. The French hate the Germans and distrust the English. The Germans above all hate the French and Poles and fear the English. The Italians have all their old dislike and distrust of the Austrians and hate the Jugo-Slavs, while they bitterly resent the lack of gratitude of the French, and feel that the Allies have ill-repaid their sacrifices."

Here is as concise a description of the state of soul of Europe as could be found. We know that it is true from the speeches of statesmen and politicians and from the writings of publicists and journalists. The author of "Invalid Europe" says little as to the feelings of the recent belligerents towards America, but we know too pretty well what they are. It is felt that having joined somewhat tardily in the war for our own protection, and having suffered far less in consequence, we have left our former associates in the lurch, and have become a harsh and exacting creditor, determined in the end to recover every penny of Europe's indebtedness to ourselves.

The only country which, according to Mr. Seligsberg, made plain to him its feelings towards America was Germany. He says, "I had misgivings as to how I, an American citizen, would be received in Germany. I may say at once that there is hardly any feeling against Americans. I was indeed surprised to find that Germans did full justice to America's motives in entering the war, and were ready to admit that the German policy had left this country no alternative. They even seemed ready to admit that America in no way desired or attempted to derive material benefit from the war. The Germans feel, however, that the fourteen points, on the strength of which the armistice was applied for, have proved a snare and a delusion. But many seemed willing to admit that deviation from these points was due less to the fault of President Wilson than to his inability to resist the cumulative and almost irresistible force of allied pressure at the Peace Conference. . . . It may sound paradoxical, but the country in which I found the greatest appreciation of America's effort in the war was Germany."

The book is full of interesting observations on the things which the author noted in Great Britain, France, Germany and other parts of Europe. There are touches of humor and broad minded sympathy which make it a very human document, while the sections dealing with Germany and Italy,

and the concluding chapter, in which the author summarizes his conclusions and shows the way to another and better condition of affairs, demonstrates that Mr. Seligsberg is a clear minded and liberal thinker. One may not agree with all his conclusions, but his premises are well stated, and he is above all unprejudiced. Those who wish to know the true conditions and state of mind in Europe today will do well to read this book. It contains a series of word pictures which show that the author went about with an observant eye, and that he missed very little which is vital and important.

THE TWIN PEAKS*

By JULIA BOYNTON GREEN

Down Market Street we tramped, the thoroughfare
    Stretched endlessly, flanked by grim walls that loom
    Cliff-wise. O pitiful, that trade must doom
To such drear duress souls that fain would share
The country sun, the country's fragrant air!
    That moment, dressed in many a creamy plume,
    Stood the wild chestnut. Pink convolvulus bloom
Painted with flush of dawn the meadows bare.

"Look!" cried my comrade, "the Twin Peaks!" His gaze
    Led mine down the long street. Lo far away
As in a frame, two mountains blue with haze;
    With rich romance they lit the sober day.
"Life's not so poor," he said, "as to begrudge
To us our glimpse of glory where we drudge."

*San Francisco.

JOB HEDGES ON "MODERN DEMOCRACY"

Those who have read "The American Commonwealth" and been brought in personal contact with Mr. Bryce, think of him as an adopted American on furlough to his birth country. That he is there, Viscount Bryce nowsie changes our view of him here.

In "The American Commonwealth" he exposed us to ourselves, instructed us in our principles, explained the evolution of our national life, made clear the workings of our political machinery, so that an American could understand it with a minimum of effort.

Then, as now, his reasoning is clear; his facts digested, not assumed, and his style companionable, illuminating and inviting.

"Modern Democracies" (Macmillan) makes Mr. Bryce a creditor of all who seek knowledge of facts gathered by a keen observer who collates them to justify no intellectual fad or expose finality of judgment as foundation of a "new school" of political philosophy.

He gives the evolution of democracies with enough of their origin and history to illuminate and clarify their present-day workings. His aim, starting with the fact and principles of democracy, is to show how it actually functions. In his own words, "It is of the Form of Government as a Form of Government—that is to say, of the features which democracies have in common—that this book, describing the phenomena as they appear in their daily working to an observer who is living in the midst of them and watching them, as one standing in a great factory sees the play and clang of the machinery all around him."

To those Americans who glibly discuss our Constitution, without reading it, valiantly and rhetorically reform our governmental procedure without studying it, and dissect politics without having come in contact with it, this work will be arresting, helpful and quieting.

To those who seek knowledge as preliminary to opinions, these volumes will be labor-saving and enlightening.

To those who will pause before rapidly vocalizing or writing exhaustively and exhaustingly on civic reform, strength will be saved and the public spared the innoclutian from ideas foreign to the principles and practices under which we live.

Space and time do not permit, in this really preliminary reference, adequate comment.

While the volume at hand discusses France, Switzerland and Canada, with due reference to the republics of antiquity (Athens) and the republics of South America, it is especially appealing in its "Considerations Applicable to Democratic Government in General."

Embraced in these considerations are clear and informing analyses of Liberty, Equality, Democracy and Education, Democracy and Religion,

The Press in a Democracy, Party, Local Self-Government, Traditions, The People, Public Opinion.

The study of this work, in addition to reading it, will clear away much of the miasma distorting the minds of those assailing modern democracy and relieve them of erecting new forms of government.

Mr. Bryce has dodged no fact, exploited no new theory. He has brought the public up to date. With unerring judgment he points to public opinion as an elemental vitalizing necessary force for successful democracy. The responsibility for that public opinion lies in truthful utterance, righteous personal conduct, and honest thinking following knowledge of facts.

JOB E. HEDGES.

SHELF OF NEW BOOKS

By GABRIEL YORKE

*DEMOCRACY AND THE HUMAN EQUATION.
By Alleyne Ireland. E. P. Dutton & Co.
THE STATE AND GOVERNMENT.
By James Quayle Dealey. D. Appleton & Co.

A TRILOGY OF CRITICISM*

To avoid starting ill feeling between the three English literary critics who happen to have come out with their views in book form all at the same time, we have listed their works in the arrangement below in which they will be found henceforth in library indexes. At the risk, however, of entering a wedge into the friendship which exists between Mr. Lynd and Mr. Squire—Mr. Lynd's book is dedicated to the latter, the "godfather to a good many of its chapters" when they first appeared as articles in London periodicals—we are going to say that the index card for Mr. Lynd's book will be thumbed long after calls for "Life and Letters" have ceased. At any rate, it is not our fault that Mr. Lynd has compiled a more enduring work. If it will give Mr. Squire any solace, we shall add that while his friend's work may endure longer, it will, in our opinion, have no greater number of readers than his own.

Mr. Squire, and the same is true of Mr. Hind, is that kind of a critic who hops, skips and jumps on his contemporaries and their works. Therefore, as these contemporaries and their works are crowded from the scene in later times, that which has been written about them must necessarily suffer neglect.

On the other hand, Mr. Lynd is of the closed variety of critic. He does not write in order to give his own impressions of men and letters, but in order to aid his subjects to make their own appeal.

He has subordinated his personality to the good intention of giving correct values. He puts his subject through only a boiling process. Mr. Hind and Mr. Squire not only boil theirs—they add flavors.

The various methods applied by the three men do not result in differences in degree so much as in differences in kind.

Confronting any one of these books with the other two of the trilogy exposes the equipment with which critics work. It shows some of the tricks of the trade—and no mean tricks either. For instance, Mr. Hind and Mr. Squire both have their fling at Joseph Conrad. One reads what the latter has to say of "Lord Jim" and wonders whether Mr. Squire had ever perused any other of Conrad's efforts. "Lord Jim" is Mr. Conrad's masterpiece—the leading of Mr. Squire's chapter says so, and the rest of the chapter is an analysis of the one work. Yet the reader feels that he knows as much about Conrad the writer after reading it as he does

after following Mr. Hind through what he tells of actually hearing the novelist express himself on his own writings and the impressions made upon Mr. Hind by half a dozen of Conrad's stories. A similar "stunt" can be done with what Mr. Lynd and Mr. Hind have to say about George Meredith and Edmund Gosse.

* * * * *

Mr. Hind in *"Authors and I"* has squeezed out the essence of his experiences as former editor of the Academy (London) and those he has had in this country in contact with men of letters.

Author after author of among the moderns, he takes up. To his essence of experience, that is to say, personal contact with each, he adds what he has extracted from his subject's writings.

He has been very careful to number them. These are fifty-eight, not including himself. He has arranged them in alphabetical order, so that he starts off with Henry Adams and Sherwood Anderson and ends with Walt Whitman and W. B. Yeats.

His is a jerky style, but without being the least bit annoying. Free prose, one might call it. A fine sense of humor adds to the enjoyment of it.

It is to Frederick Dixon, the editor of he "Christian Science Monitor," that we are really indebted for this book of essays, since it was at his suggestion that the individual chapters first appeared as "columns" in that newspaper. Another recent collection of articles by Mr. Hind, also originally appearing in that paper is *"Art and I."* In the newspaper they were published under the heading "A Bookman's Memories." We tell this at the end, instead of at the beginning, of what there is to say of *"Authors and I."* Mr. Hind did the same thing. Our reason for doing so is his.

* * * * *

"Life and Letters" reveals that Mr. Squire can better be described as an essayist than as a critic. Indeed, if we are to apply the rules of criticism laid down by his friend Robert Lynd,—of which more later,—he is no critic at all.

The subjects of his essays, all of which have already appeared in "Land and Water," range from Keat's Fame, Anatole France, Edward Thomas and Four Papers on Shakespeare to Initials, Goaks (Jokes) and Humor, Short Cuts to Helicon and a treatise on the use of One for the first personal pronoun.

His essays on what seem to be trivial matters, but which are not, would be well worth having apart from the rest of the collection.

* * * * *

Mr. Lynd, in selecting the subjects to which he applies a very thorough interest as the basis of the collection of articles which make up his *"Art and Letters,"* shows a true courage.

Let the reader remember that of such persons and things as Mr. Pepys, Thomas Campion, The Wisdom of Coleridge, The Theory of Poetry and Aspects of Shelley—to select only a few with which he deals—so much has been said by all sorts and kinds of writers from jealous contemporaries down to the latest compiler of dull text books and then ask whether a critic must not have a courage born of a great self-confidence to add anything to what has already been written about them. Such self-confidence Mr. Lynd has, and well he may. His criticisms are so fair, so free from

bias and even emotion, that they may be described as not short of "scientific," if there can be scientific criticism of things literary.

Were he less of a master of criticism he would not dare to outline a theory of it as he does in two essays called the Critic as Destroyer and Book Reviewing.

Criticism, he insists, is praise. It must accept literature as it is, without regard to likes or dislikes of critics themselves. The function called destructive criticism, is not criticism at all, but the winnowing out of that which is not worthy of the critics' attention or else it is the combatting of the partisan admirers of authors and their works, for they, the partisans, are as harmful to literature as is unfair carping at their idols.

As to book reveiwing—his idea is that its function is to present books instead of merely presenting remarks about them. A very good conception of the function it is, yet one that is very difficult to maintain when reviewing, for instance, a book like his own, for a series of articles caught up from periodicals where they originally appeared and then placed together to make a book lack a continuity of theme that makes a fair presentation of the whole impossible in the space at the disposal of the ordinary reviewer.

THE ART OF LETTERS.
By Robert Lynd. Charles Scribner's Sons. $3.75.
AUTHORS AND I.
By C. Lewes Hind. John Lane Company. $2.50.
LIFE AND LETTERS.
By J. C. Squire. George H. Doran Co. $3.00.

FROM THE LABORATORY OF HISTORY*

As the title of M. Nekludoff's book might indicate, there are revelations between its covers. No less could be expected of the reminiscences of one who writes of his former services as Russian Minister at Sofia and Stockholm and Ambassador at Madrid, covering the years from 1911 to 1917.

Not all nor even the important revelations he makes are those which he consciously puts down as such. As an instance, he reveals without intending to do so that though our American school of "shirt sleeve" diplomacy has been the mirth of nations, it could have made no greater mess of things than the "morning coat" school did of European affairs in the past ten years.

Professor Sloane has very aptly named the Balkans "The Laboratory of History." In the year 1911 the Russian Foreign Office sent M. Nekludoff into that laboratory. He did not know, nor did Ferdinand of Bulgaria, Danev, Risov and the others with whom he there labored, that they were at work on the making of the Great Catastrophe. Like the workmen on some gigantic engineering project, they had only vague ideas of the whole effort. They saw specific tasks and performed them; meanwhile the engineers in Berlin and Vienna had the blue prints before them and appreciated the significance of the work as a whole.

M. Nekludoff's work in the laboratory was to hold Bulgaria's sympathies to Russia. In this he failed, but his failure earned him no discredit. Unable to cope with the intrigue and propaganda emanating from the German and Austrian capitals, through lack of support and understanding on the part of his own government, and likewise unable to pin

the shifty and crafty Bulgarian monarch in a definite position, his mission was an impossible one from the start. The former Russian Minister reveals how he warned his government of the dangers to be expected from a Serbo-Bulgarian alliance in 1911-1912. Not heeding the warning, the Russian bear found itself with Bulgaria tugging at the ring she had put through its nose. Thus, through the apathy of Sazonoff, the Russian Foreign Secretary, the beginnings of the Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913 had their origin. M. Nekludoff's adverse criticism of the Serbo-Bulgarian Alliance cost him the good-will of Ferdinand early in his career at Sofia; intrigues against him on the part of members of his own official family at the Russian Legation made matters still worse. His position became untenable and his relations with the Bulgarian monarch ended in an interview in which the minister cast aside the niceties of diplomatic courtesy and deliberately snubbed the ruler.

His recall became inevitable and he was next sent to Stockholm. Had he been properly supported not only by his colleagues at Petrograd, but by those who represented Russia at other Balkan courts, the Balkan wars and their terrible sequence might have been delayed to say the least.

It was in the spring of 1914 that M. Nekludoff went to Stockholm, so it was not long after he had become accustomed to his new duties that the war and its flood of problems broke upon him. Here he rendered a great service in inducing his government to follow the example of England and France in guaranteeing respect for Swedish neutrality. This performance had not a little to do with keeping Sweden from joining the Central Powers.

As things began to go wrong in Russia, his work in Stockholm involved more his relations with his own government than those which he had to maintain with that of Sweden. German propagandists, busy-bodies from England and neutral countries, and Russians in foreign pay went through or attempted to go through Stockholm to Petrograd, whilst from the latter, after the fall of the Czar, came a train of politicians and *intrigantes*. To a pronounced royalist both sets were more than mere irritations to Mr. Nekludoff and finally he became so nauseated from his experiences that he was "kicked upstairs" and made Ambassador to the Spanish Court. Four months there at the bidding of Kerensky were enough to make him resign from the Russian Foreign Service, with which he had been connected since 1881.

At no time in his writings does M. Nekludoff make a pretense of hiding his faithfulness to the Czar. Yet he is so honest and sincere in his loyalty that his attitude must earn admiration. His book accomplishes nothing more than shedding additional light on political machinations in Europe which already have become bleached in the sunlight, nor are there any startling revelations. This is not to say, however, that the work is without value. His exceedingly frank judgment passed on contemporaries, as well as the rapidity of his style, recommend it entirely aside from consideration of its place in the great harvest of works connected with the war.

The *"Memoirs of Ismail Kemal Bey"* come also from the Laboratory of History. They give us, actually, the history of a nation which died before it was born—Albania. In those ancient days prior to 1914 there was, the reader will remember, no small space devoted in our newspapers to the affairs of this state. William of Wied—what has become of him?

And do the editors of one of the London newspapers remember one of their headlines back in 1913? "Roosevelt as King of Albania."

These memoirs, as William Morton Fullerton points out in an introduction to them, are something more than the observations of a very wise old Albanian gentleman. Incidentally he was more gentleman than writer, for to Mr. Story must go the credit for getting them on paper. Ismail Kemal Bey was an elusive source, but very little has been lost owing to Mr. Story's overcoming the difficulties of keeping him in one place.

Ismail Kemal Bey's life began in the Dark Ages, that is to say, in 1844. Therefore, he was mature enough to appreciate the consequences of the Franco-Prussian war as they affected the Near East. Constantinople realized that the defeat of France meant the disappearance of one of the great securities of the Turkish Empire. When the Germans, or better, the Prussians, began a systematic campaign of intrigue at the Porte, the fruits of their victory began to mature.

In none of the multiplicity of plots, counterplots and even wars which beset the Balkans from 1871 right down to the time when the representatives of the small nations were pleading their cases before Mr. Wilson at Paris, did Ismail Kemal Bey fail to act an important part.

Space will not permit more than a very brief outline of his experiences. After the Russo-Turkish war his political activities earned him an exile of seven years. But he returned and was made Governor of Bolu (1884), where he put down brigandage. Afterwards he held a similar position in Gallipoli. From this post he went on to become Governor-General of Beyrouth. In Crete, too, he was Governor General. In fact, from 1892 to 1910 he was the administrative head of various of the Turkish provinces and as a politician had more than his share of ups and downs, troubles with successive Sultans, negotiations with all kinds of puppets from Western and Central Europe.

In 1911, when war between Italy and Turkey was imminent, he saw the danger to Albania. He had not a little to do with the uprising of that Province against the Young Turks. Later, when the Albanians were given independence from Turkey, his country was sacrificed at the Conference of London (at the close of the Balkans War of 1913) in order "to keep peace." The reduced nation then had William of Wied foisted upon it. Nevertheless, in spite of three months' experience under this Prince, the Albanians watched his departure with sadness, knowing that with him their dreams of nationality also went. The Great War was then already in progress: when the giants went to grips Albania was completely forgotten—and remained forgotten at Paris in 1918.

Ismail Kemal Bey's life, viewed from what he tried to accomplish, was a failure. His *memoirs* are not. Mr. Fullerton suggests that the picture they present is of a vanished world—which is not so. Under the surface of the Treaty of Versailles and those which have succeeded it, the forces of which Ismail Kemal Bey was a part, are still alive. We shall again have "the Balkan question." The Laboratory of History is intact and those who would understand what is yet to come out of it must read of Ismail Kemal Bey's experiences in it.

*Diplomatic Reminiscences.
By A. Nekludoff; translated from the French by Alexandra Paget. E. P. Dutton & Company.
Memoirs of Ismail Kemal Bey.
Edited by Sommerville Story. E. P. Dutton & Company.

LAW LINKED UP WITH HISTORY

The first of the volumes on Historical Jurisprudence which Professor Vinogradoff has been preparing has now appeared. Though it closes with the greater part of his task yet to be done, the present volume stands as a complete study in itself—or two of them, if the reader will permit. Almost half of it consists of an Introduction to the whole series. The remaining half is a complete thesis on Tribal Law.

Encouraged by the success of former works on Roman Law in Medieval Europe and Essays on Legal History, he has now entered a more comprehensive field, starting with the concepts of law among primitive peoples to sweep, later, through a comparative study which will bring the treatise down to times quite modern. The value, as Professor Vinogradoff himself points out, of such a study will exist not alone for the practical lawyer, but also for the student of social science, the philosopher and for every educated man.

The Introduction is a thesis on the relation of law to logic, psychology, social science and political theory, and, in addition, on the methods and schools of jurisprudence—those of the rationalists, nationalists and evolutionists.

The relation between logic and law lies in the former providing the lawyer with a framework for his reasoning. Sociological considerations may lead him to conclusions which, in the schoolroom, would not be reached through pure logic starting with the same premise. Logic is an instrument of law, not the purpose of it. The relation of law to psychology has led to a new consideration of motive—hence the "brainstorm" defense in American courts and the leniency with "crimes of passion" in France. In covering these points, however, Professor Vinogradoff does not employ these vulgarisms. Statistics, history and political economy (in its various branches) are parts of that very modern science, social psychology, which are working other new developments of law. As for law and political theory their relationship, or rather the cooperation of the two, will solve two great problems—that of the relation of the State and Law to the individual and that of the relation of these to various social groups, the family, labor unions, churches and the many others which men insist upon entering into.

The rational school of jurisprudence has had its achievements. It has helped to explain the working of the machinery of government, but it does not solve that of the origin of sovereignty. This is a very important point and one which is recommended to the attention of the author of "Democracy and the Human Equation," reviewed elsewhere in these pages. The theory of right being on the side of the majority, best stated, we believe, by Rousseau, is lately having curious, even dangerous results; so that one of our American groups of reformers has defended itself with the dictum: God and a minority make a majority.

On the other hand, the rigidity of the nationalist school of jurisprudence, "the Historical School of Law," sets limitations to progress in one of the departments of human thought. There must be a conscious endeavor, in law, to solve the problems of social existence. In a time when these

(*Continued on page* 12)

Buy a Book a Week

Lippincott Books

At All Bookstores

PRINCESS SALOME

A Tale of the Days of Camel-Bells

By DR. BURRIS JENKINS

Frontispiece. $2.00 *net*

This remarkable story will be read and reread, *admired* by some for the thrilling tale it tells, *discussed* by others for the manner of th telling, and *cherished* by thousands for the inspiration and faith it will give.

A vital and heart moving novel of the days when faith dawned. A book that will live and go down through the years in a class with QUO VADIS and BEN HUR. It is startling, dramatic, and makes real to us the wonder and romance which must have been experienced by the early followers of Christ.

THE TRYST

By GRACE LIVINGSTON HILL

Frontispiece in color. $2.00

Mrs. Hill's novels are the wished for books in many homes. They provide enjoyment for the whole family circle. Nothing unsavory ever creeps between the pages to mar her narratives. "The Tryst" is the gripping story of John Preeves,—how in his seeking after God he finds Patty Merrill, and helps to clear the mystery that surrounds her life as well as the mystery of a death. By far the strongest story by this popular writer.

THE MYSTERY OF THE SYCAMORE

By CAROLYN WELLS

Frontispiece in color. $2.00

Carolyn Wells has unsurpassed genius in creating plots and incidents that are unusual, bizarre and baffling to the lover of mystery. Each new "Fleming Stone" story is original and different. A cry of fire, a murder, and a voluntary confesson of three people to the crime is the crux of the latest and most gripping story from her pen.

NO DEFENCE

By GILBERT PARKER

4 *Illustrations.* $2.00

No Defence will be classed with the really great romances. It is Parker at his best. "It has dash, fire, and romance; dramatic incidents, vivid pictures of West Indian forest and plantation life, and an appealing love tale."—*The Outlook.*

HAPPY HOUSE

By JANE ABBOTT

Frontispiece in color. $1.75

This is the exceptional novel which everyone enjoys. It is the spirit of youth and love and joy caught between the covers of a book and done in the wholesome American way.

Recent Outstanding Books

SEEING THE FAR WEST

By JOHN T. FARIS

A remarkable panorama of the scenic glories of the States from the Rockies to the Pacific.

113 *Illustrations and two maps.* $6.00

THE BOOK OF JOB

By MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., P. H. D., LL. D.

Dr. Jastrow with rare insight and charm brings forth into the light of understanding this most glorious of poems.

Frontispiece, Octavo. $4.00

IN OLD PENNSYLVANIA TOWNS

By ANNE HOLLINGSWORTH WHARTON

A valuable addition to the literature of men, women and manners of earlier days, replete with entertaining information for the traveler as well.

32 *Illustrations.* $5.00

THE ORIENT IN BIBLE TIMES

By ELIHU GRANT

A fascinating and historic panorama of the Oriental world, its peoples, civilizations, and history during Bible times.

30 *Illustrations and a map.* $2.50

TRAINING FOR LIBRARIANSHIP

By J. A. FREIDEL, M. A.

Gives interesting facts and data regarding all phases of public and special library work, useful to anyone who contemplates entering or advancing in the profession.

8 *Illustrations.* $1.75

THE CHARM OF FINE MANNERS

By MRS. HELEN ELSIN STARRETT

This character forming book for young girls is being accepted generally as the Key book of the great movement for better morals and manners in the young which is now sweeping the country.

$1.00

"BE ONE OF US"

is what Sir Thomas Lipton, the famous yachtsman, said to our head Manager,

Dr. A. S. MACKENZIE

last summer, and so say we to you if you are or expect to be a teacher in a reputable school or university.

Can you afford to dispense with an educational broker who understands teaching as a business?

ALBERT TEACHERS' AGENCY
437 Fifth Ave. New York City
(Cor. 39th St.)
Please mention The Forum when you write.

FREDERIC WARREN

Studio of Singing

349 Central Park West New York

The Lawrence and Memorial Associated Hospitals offers a two year and three months' course in registered Training School to earnest young women. The hospital is modern, well equipped beautifully situated; capacity 0 beds; nurses have eight-hour day. Address New London, Conn. MISS K. M. PRINDIVILLE, Supt.

LeLivre Contemporian

A magazine devoted to Foreign literature. Fall 1920 issue now ready.

Contains reviews of recent French, Italian and Spanish books. Send for copy.

SCHOENHOF'S

15 Beacon Street - - BOSTON, MASS.

Distinctive Styles in Glasses

J. H. MAGUIRE
OPTICIAN

684 Sixth Avenue New York
Between 39th and 40th Streets

Our Skill is ut Your Service

ANNOUNCEMENT!

THE FORUM INFORMATION SERVICE has been inaugurated because so many of our subscribers write to THE FORUM asking for lecturers or speakers to participate in debate on some of the subjects that are discussed in THE FORUM.

We have, therefore, established the **INFORMATION SERVICE** for lecturers, speakers, and general information on public questions. For this service there is no charge to subscribers.

Address all communications to THE FORUM INFORMATION SERVICE, THE FORUM, Rooms 1715-1716, 354 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

LE MATIN, FIGARO

Le Journal and other Paris dailies; Vie Parisienne Sourire, all comic and illustrated Paris weeklies. Over 80 different French Periodicals, Art, Music, Fashions, Science, etc., etc. Send for complete list.

5000 French books in stock—history, fiction New Books as published. .50 editions. Sed. for list.

LA COMPAGNIE-CHAGNON
497 Seventh Ave. at 37th St., New York

Oxford Book Shop—First Editions books for Collectors. Interesting items by and about Walt Whitman. Sign of the Sparrow, 42 Lexington Avenue, New York. New catalogue on request.

EAGLE "MIKADO"

PENCIL No. 174

For Sale at your dealers
Made in five grades

Conceded to be the finest Pencil made for general use

EAGLE PENCIL COMPANY
NEW YORK



This Article is Hand Tooled

Genuine hand tooling is hand workmanship after the manner of the ancient Spanish and Moorish workers. ¶Sometimes cheaper goods are erroneously termed "hand tooled." In these goods many identical designs are made by stamping or embossing in one operation from a die. ¶Genuine hand tooling lasts as long as the leather.

Specify the genuine when buying leather goods.

P. W. LAMBERT & CO.
NEW YORK CITY

BOOKS

Every American Should Read:

Robert Lansing . . PEACE NEGOTIATIONS $3.00
Bishop . THEODORE ROOSEVELT AND HIS TIME, 2 vols. 10.00
AMERICANIZATION OF EDWARD BOK (an autobiography) 5.00
James Huneker . . . . STEEPLE JACK, 2 vols 10.00
Lord Charnwood . ABRAHAM LINCOLN 3.00

BUY A BOOK A WEEK

McDEVITT-WILSON'S, Inc.
Booksellers
30 Church St., New York

Read "ZARATHUSTRAN" queer little magazine p lished for odd people w do their own thinking. With other "crank" literatu and "New-Thought Era." Six months for 25c.

ATELIER TRADE SERVICE, London, Onta

problems are so changing and increasing no school of law which does not admit of its flexibility and growth can endure.

Here the evolutionists—those whose reasonings in matters of jurisprudence came to be affected by Darwinianism—enter to find the mean between stability of legal systems and their adaptation to the needs springing from progress in other social lines.

We have devoted this amount of space to Professor Vinogradoff's Introduction because it is one which must serve for all the volumes to come and must therefore receive a commensurate amount of attention.

* * * * *

It is in the second part of the volume that the more interesting work of the author has been done. His study of Tribal Law is extremely fascinating. Under the heading "Elements of the Family" he deals with the selection of mates, relationships between mother and father, "in-laws" and marriage, coming to the following conclusions: Marital union is a highly malleable institution; in the development of marriage law one rigid course was not followed by all of mankind; unions in primitive tribes were "matings," not marriage; as to the latter in its formulative stages as an institution, it is evident that there was not a single course followed by all the tribes of the earth in developing it, nor are there evidences of general sex promiscuity among primitive people; three motives, attraction of bodily and mental features, preception of the laws of cross-breeding and the policy of social order, led to exorganic restrictions in mating; and the wish of groups to hold together against outsiders as well as that to prevent dispersion of family property, account for endogamy.

Space does not permit an outline of his treatment of Aryan Culture or of the Clan and the Tribe. We shall, therefore, have to be content with pointing out that in arriving at any of his conclusions, he has made

(*Continued on page* 15)

Printing

ANY man, any organization, is lucky which can call intelligently on the past for aid in solving problems of the present.

¶ Our plant is complete, day and night service enables us to keep costs at a minimum.

Conway Printing Company
Lithographers, Printers and Binders
416-418 West 33rd Street, NEW YORK

Just Published

CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHIC REPORT OF
The Greatest DEBATE in a Decade!
Prof. E. R. A. SELIGMAN
Head of the Department of Economics, Columbia University
vs.
Prof. SCOTT NEARING
Rand School of Social Science
Introduction by OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor of *The Nation*

Subject:

Resolved: That Capitalism has more to offer to the workers of the United States than has Socialism.

Held in New York City, January 23, 1921
Before an Audience of 3,500

Illustrated by photographs of the debaters.
Paper cover, 50c.; cloth, $1.00 (By mail 10c. extra).

THE FINE ARTS GUILD Dept. F.
27 West 8th Street N. Y. City



OFFICE FURNITURE

We are overstocked and are offering a varied selection of

DESKS, TABLES, CHAIRS, ETC.

New goods of standard make and quality at

APPEALINGLY LOW PRICES

No salesmanship will be required to sell this stock at the prices marked.

If you are unable to call and inspect, write and advise us of your requirements and we will send you a specially prepared circular.

U. S. DESK COMPANY, Inc.
119 East 34 Street,
New York City

We also have a limited supply of used office furniture taken in exchange.

Our Contributors

BARON K. SHIDEHARA is Japanese Ambassador to the United States and one of the Orient's distinguished diplomats. The present paper shows him not only as a keen student of the diplomatic school but a brilliant man of letters.

GEORGE BRANDES was born in Copenhagen and except for a brief sojourn in America, has lived most of his life abroad. His literary career has been marked by a series of triumphs and his contribution to the literature of the day has won him international renown as a critic and author of extraordinary merit.

HON. DANIEL F. COHALAN concludes in this number the second of two notable articles on "Our Foreign Policy". The writer is a New York Supreme Court Justice, a student of international affairs, and, was one of the leaders in the fight against the League of Nations.

MAJOR GENERAL WILLIAM GEORGE HAAN, who writes on "Our New Army", has won many military honors in the American Army. During his service in Cuba and the Philippines, he was three times recommended for conspicuous conduct in action and won several citations for the part he played as a commander in the World War.

JOHN CANDEE DEAN, a noted student and writer on astronomy, physics and sociology, has been a contributor to scientific and literary magazines in this country and abroad for many years. In addition to his scholarly activities, Mr. Dean is a well known figure in the industrial world—, in his own language—"a manufacturer all my life".

GERTRUDE ATHERTON, widely known for her successful novels, has spent a good part of her life abroad, where she has given much study to the feminist movement.

CONGRESSMAN JULIUS KAHN, who discusses the "Need for Disarmament," led and won the campaign in the Sixty-first Congress to hold the Panama-Pacific Exposition at San Francisco and was a leader in securing passage of the Selective Draft Act in extra session of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

CHARLES HENRY MELTZER, a dramatist and critic, has been long associated with the prominent papers and magazines of the country in this capacity. He has made many English singing versions of French, German and Italian Grand Opera librettos.

REAR ADMIRAL FISKE is a distinugished naval officer and an author on electrical and naval subjects.

HON. JOHN F. HYLAN, Mayor of New York City, has taken an active part in the fight for a five-cent fare in the Metropolis and has been a close student of transit problems all his life.

THOMAS L. MASON has for many years been an Editor and writer on humorous subjects

A. L. JACKSON is a negro, graduate of Harvard University and associated with the International Committee of the Y. M. C. A.

JOB. E. HEDGES is a lawyer and author on political subjects.

LEE S. CRANDALL, curator of the Bronx Zoo.

Beech-Nut Ginger Ale

"Great!

©1920, B-N.P.Co.

A FLAVOR YOU REMEMBER

THE "fine flavor" of Beech-Nut Ginger Ale is the first thing you notice —the last thing you forget.

A *delicate* flavor—with all the refreshment, zest, and mellowness of blended tropical gingers. Delightfully refreshing at any season.

Bottles hold two glasses. Moderate price. Get it by the case—today.

BEECH-NUT PACKING COMPANY
CANAJOHARIE, NEW YORK

"Foods of Finest Flavor"

the widest use of anthropology, drawing examples from the records of early Western European tribes, modern descriptions of tribal customs in the Western hemisphere, the Old Testament, Sagas and Vedas—in fact, from all the sources extant.

The value of it is that of historical treatises in any science. In the particular science of jurisprudence it has the added value of making even the layman question customs and institutions, which have been fixed as being right only because they were traditional—women's rights as to property, parental assent for the marriage even of adults, succession and inheritance, and so forth. Lastly, it proves that in law, as in other things, nothing endures; there are changes, decays and developments. What we know for certain is right today may be wrong a century hence.

Volume I. Introduction: Tribal Law. By Sir Paul Vinogradoff. Oxford English Literature.

By John Louis Haney, Ph. D. Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

THE OUTDOOR LIFE

Under the title "Waiting in the Wilderness,"* Enos A. Mills has gathered a collection of the out-of-door stories for which he has become well-known. Most of them are good stories and will do no harm to Mr. Mills' well-earned reputation as a nature writer. There are seventeen "chapters," each being, in reality, a unit, without connection with the others. The subjects include intimate accounts of the habits of beavers, grizzy and black bears, mountain lions, prairie "dogs" and "ground hogs." Among these, are interspersed descriptions of snow-slides, an essay on the erosive effects of streams, two first-rate dog stories, a hair-raising Indian tale, and a number of rambling records of one-man trips in the wilds. Aimless as many of these last may seem, all are well spread with anecdotes and facts that are full of interest. Many of the "chapters" have already appeared in various periodicals but there is a good deal of original matter. There are sixteen illustrations from photographs, most of which are excellent, though some appear to have slight connection with the text.

Mr. Mills' many years of out-door life have given him great powers of observation and equipped him as a full-fledged "nature guide." His guidance is not confined to the field, for by means of the printed page he is able to carry his chosen work into a wider circle. The stories of animal habits, in which he is at his best, are distinctive for adherence to fact and freedom from the exaggeration of many other authors.

Mr. Mills has something of a reputation as a humorist but the only story in this vein contained in the book will not enhance it. It is a really interesting account of a fossil-hunt but the "jokes" with which it is enlivened are clumsy and lacking in sprightliness. On the other hand, the record of lonely days spent in following the snowy trails of mountain lions and grizzlies show the author's abilities of observation and interpretation to be unusual.

Altogether, here is a nature book that will be read with pleasure by the fireside philosopher, as well as by the lover of outdoor adventure.

Lee S. Crandall.

---

*Waiting in the Wilderness.

By Enos A. Mills. 16 full-page illustrations from photographs. Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City and Toronto, 1921. $2.50 net.

The New Republic and Yourself—

Are you one of those who give more than lip service to democracy, who believe in political democracy, but also in that intellectual democracy that means that every man must do his own thinking?

The New Republic is the journal of news and interpretation that was founded on the basis that the hope of democracy lies in the formation of an enlightened public opinion, a public opinion that should not guess, but *know* and know, not from solemn handed-down ideas, but from discussion, criticism and thinking through.

On that basis *The New Republic* has attained the largest circulation of any journal of its kind in the English-speaking world. For it gives its readers each week news of all the important events in the world of politics, art and literature, together with sane interpretation from a liberal point of view. It does not "lay down the law," but says, rather, "This is how it looks to us. What do you think?"

There's hope and purpose—and enjoyment as well—in such an attitude for those who find joy in matching their opinions with other opinions; who prefer having their opinions sharpened to having them petted.

If you are one of these, *The New Republic* is your sort of journal, and "The Outline of History," by H. G. Wells, is your sort of book, for both book and journal seek to reveal to all mankind "its common interest, the need to realize a common cause, and the certainty of common disaster if that common cause does not inspire us." It has been issued in a special *New Republic Edition,* 2 Volumes, over 1300 pages, bound in Holliston cloth, gold lettered and stamped with the ship of *The New Republic.*

Last Fall *The New Republic* secured the sole premium rights to this great work and in the five months since its publication here nine large printings have been sold out.